









**WHOLE PROCEEDINGS**  
**BEFORE THE**  
**PRESBYTERY OF DUMBARTON,**  
**AND SYNOD OF GLASGOW AND AYR,**  
**IN THE CASE OF THE**  
**REV. JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL.-**  
**MINISTER OF ROW.**  
  
**INCLUDING THE LIBEL, ANSWERS TO THE LIBEL,**  
**EVIDENCE, AND SPEECHES.**

---

**R. B. LUSK, GREENOCK ;**  
**WAUGH & INNES, AND J. LINDSAY & CO. EDINBURGH ;**  
**W. M'COMB, BELFAST ; R. M. TIMS, DUBLIN ;**  
**HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO, AND J. NISBET, LONDON**  
**1831.**



# PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF

THE REV. JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL.

---

THE intense interest so extensively awakened by the proceedings in the church courts, in the case of the Rev. J. M'Leod Campbell, minister of Row, together with the paramount importance of the case itself, obviously render it most desirable, that the church in general should be put in possession of a faithful record of *all* these proceedings.

The compiler of the following pages, has been induced to undertake this task, in consequence, chiefly, of being in a condition to state with accuracy, the facts in the history of the case previously to its becoming a matter of record; and of being able to add to the series of authentic documents, the substance of notes, taken in short hand, of most of the discussions connected with them, which have taken place in the inferior courts. Although the facts antecedent to the date of the earliest of these documents, are well known in the immediate vicinity of Row, they are,

however, comparatively little known at a distance; and it may not be unimportant to the cause of truth, to put all who feel an interest in the case, in possession of every particular necessary for coming to a dispassionate judgment on its merits.

Mr. Campbell was settled in the parish of Row, in Sept. 1825; but it was not until the summer of 1827, that any offence appeared to have been taken at the matter of his teaching. At that period the chief peculiarity of his sermons seemed to be the strong statements they contained on the assurance of faith, and the connexion that exists between man's belief in the testimony of God and his consciousness of being in the condition of having passed from death to life. The doctrine of the love of God to every man, as declared in the death of Christ for all, though evidently implied in his sermons, was seldom broadly or pointedly stated, and did not appear to have that prominence and importance in his mind, which it afterwards assumed.

Toward the close of the year 1828, it is believed in the month of December, the first attempt was made to bring the subject matter of Mr. Campbell's teaching under the consideration of the church courts. About this time, a petition, signed by a few individuals, was lodged with the presbytery of Dumbarton, in which a variety of charges were brought against Mr. C., and among others his having taught that there was no occasion for repentance—no such thing as a good hope through grace—that Christ was no law-giver, &c. &c. After this petition was received by the Presbytery, and, it is believed, after part of it was taken down in the Minutes, it was discovered to bear

no date, an informality which made it necessary to return it to the petitioners.

In March, 1829, another petition of the same tenor, signed by three or four individuals (none of them of the number of those who subsequently brought forward the libel) was presented to the Presbytery. Only two of the petitioners appeared. Of these the name of one was struck off the petition, as it appeared that he had, for many years, been refused church privileges, and consequently could not be considered a member of the church. The other was prevailed upon, by one of Mr. Campbell's co-presbyters, to withdraw the petition for a time. This petition was never afterwards presented; nor did any of the same parties again appear before the Presbytery in any matter connected with this case.

On the 30th March, 1830, the following Memorial was presented to the Presbytery.

Memorial of the undersigned Heads of Families and others in communion with the Church of Row, to the Reverend the Presbytery of Dumbarton.

Your memorialists wish to remind your Reverend Presbytery of a petition presented to you about a year ago, signed by certain of our fellow parishioners, representing that certain unsound pernicious doctrines, contrary to Scripture and the Standards of the National Church, had, for some time, been constantly preached and taught in Row church and parish, by the Rev. John M. Campbell, minister of that parish.

Your memorialists had earnestly hoped that mature reflection during the twelve months for which it had been agreed in the Presbytery to defer the proceedings on the petition, would have led to a cure of the evil complained of. But not only have the original obnoxious tenets been inculcated by Mr. Campbell with increased earnestness ever since—it is with deep sorrow we say it—but a number of other “unprofitable questions” have been agitated, and doctrines, in

our opinion, even still more pernicious, have been introduced; for example, that of universal pardon. It must, indeed, be superfluous to urge on the notice of your Reverend Presbytery, what has become a matter of notoriety in the remote parts of the kingdom.

Your memorialists have been induced, though reluctantly, to recall your attention to this matter, in order that you may take measures for effectually checking that constantly increasing, most painful and pernicious state of discord into which the Parish has fallen; and for securing our youth from unavoidably falling into what we conceive to be hurtful errors.

Row, March 9th, 1830.

(Signed)

JOHN ORR.  
 GEORGE M'LELLAN.  
 PARLAN M'FARLAN.  
 ALEX. M'LEOD.  
 JOHN THOMSON.  
 A. LENNOX.  
 ALEX M'DOUGAL.  
 JAMES M'KINLAY, Jun.  
 PETER COCHRAN.  
 JAMES COCHRAN, Jun.  
 JOHN M'KINLAY.  
 PETER TURNER.

After this memorial was read, one of the members of Presbytery observed, that this was a very important and very delicate question; and that all would be sensible that the less that was said about it, in the present state of matters, the better.—That every person was fully aware of the evil complained of, and that he had no doubt something must be done for the parish; but that having a brother to deal with, some delicacy was necessary; and he would, therefore, propose, that a small committee be appointed to commune with Mr. Campbell, previous to any further step.

It being asked if all the memorialists were members of the church? One of the memorialists replied, "I am in communion with the church, and we have all an interest in this business. We have families rising up, and we must look to ourselves and our families. This is not a private thing, done in a corner: the ministers of the church, all around us, have taken it up. They have both written against these doctrines, and spoken against them from the pulpit, and have given them the name of 'Heresy.'"

Another memorial was then presented, signed by about 80 householders and heads of families of the parish of Row, to the following purport:—

That the memorialists had recently learned, that a petition either had been, or was about to be presented to the Presbytery, complaining of Mr. Campbell, their minister, as teaching certain doctrines; and having learned that great eagerness had been manifested to get names to that petition, that they felt themselves called upon to testify their undiminished attachment to Mr. Campbell, as their pastor, and to state, that Mr. Campbell continued fervently, in season and out of season, to press on his people the necessity of believing the gospel, of resting on the Lord Jesus Christ alone for salvation, of departing from all iniquity, and living in the hope of a blessed immortality; and that these, his labours of love, had not been without much success; and they trusted that nothing would be done by the Presbytery to weaken the hands of so faithful a minister of the gospel.

This memorial in favour of Mr. Campbell, the Presbytery refused to receive, and ordered the other to be laid on the table. After some discussion, during which another course was proposed by some members,

\* The Compiler, not being able to procure a copy of this Memorial has given the substance of it from the notes of the Reporter, who was present.



a committee of six was appointed, to converse, with Mr. Campbell, *quam primum*, and report to the next meeting of Presbytery. Mr. Campbell objected to the appointment of a committee, at that stage of the proceedings, as altogether unconstitutional and incompetent; but was told that the Presbytery had already decided on pursuing that course, and could not re-consider the matter.

The following is the minute of the committee appointed to confer with Mr. Campbell, together with Mr. C.'s reasons for not conferring with the committee.

At the Ferry-of-Balloch Inn, the sixth day of April, 1830.

The Committee appointed to converse with Mr. Campbell met in consequence of notice from the Convener. Present, The Rev. Dr. Graham, Dr. Hamilton, Messrs. Proudfoot, Lochore, and Niven, with Mr. Campbell.

Dr. Graham in the Chair.

Mr. Lochore was chosen Clerk.

The extract minute of Presbytery, appointing this committee, was read.

Upon a question put by Mr. Campbell, as to the precise object of this meeting, the committee stated, that it was for the purpose of ascertaining Mr. Campbell's views of the doctrine and worship of this church.

It was further asked by Mr. Campbell, upon what ground do the committee conceive themselves appointed to converse with him on the above subjects.

The committee consider that an answer to this question is unnecessary, after reading the extract of the minute of presbytery, containing a memorial from certain heads of families, and others of the parish of Row—representing that unsound and pernicious doctrines had been preached in the church of Row, by Mr. Campbell.

The committee agree to throw their further procedure into the form of question and answer, and to take down as far as possible the *ipsissima verba*.

Mr. Campbell declined conversing with the committee for reasons which he gave in in writing, and requested should be engrossed in the minutes of the committee—~~which~~ reasons, after mature deliberation, the committee refused to engross, in respect that the said reasons refer not to any act of the committee, but to an alleged irregularity on the part of the Presbytery, in the appointment of the committee. But they appoint the said reasons to be authenticated and transmitted along with this report.

The committee deeply regret this termination of their labours, as they had ardently hoped, that in the course of a free and brotherly conversation, some steps might have been taken towards an adjustment of the differences between Mr. Campbell and some of his parishioners, and as they now fear that there is no room for any amicable arrangement.

(Signed) JOHN GRAHAM, Convener.

#### MR. CAMPBELL'S REASONS, &c.

Mr. Campbell then stated, that while he felt the utmost respect for his brethren of the Presbytery, and for the committee, and had accordingly met with his brethren to-day, on having the meeting intimated to him, he still feels it his duty to himself, as a member of the church, and to his brethren in the church, whose rights may suffer in his person, to decline, in the particular circumstances of the case, to confer, on the subject above mentioned, with the committee, acting upon the above referred to ground—for the following reasons :

Imo. These circumstances in the nomination of the committee, induce Mr. C. thus to decline, viz., The memorial referred to having been presented, two measures were proposed. These occasioned some discussion, which occupied some time—at last, that which has occasioned the present meeting was adopted. When this took place, Mr. Campbell did not observe what was done, not from any inattention or indifference, but from long consulting the form of process in a church law authority—his view of which, he was speaking of to a co-presbyter near him, feeling it time enough to speak when the Presbytery had made a choice between the two measures before them, and taking for granted that *care would*

*be taken* that he should be aware of what was done, before any thing was finally fixed upon. When Mr. C.'s attention was drawn to the determination of the Presbytery, by a movement which indicated that they were going to another subject, and when he inquired what was the state of proceedings, he was told that the committee was appointed, and that it was final. Mr. Campbell then desired to object to the course adopted, and was told that it was too late; and this reply, while Mr. Campbell manifested a distinct anxiety that they would regard the matter as still open, and reconsider it, was still adhered to, although the sederunt was not yet closed. Mr. Campbell intended to state, had he been permitted, objections to the course adopted, which, he may presume, would have induced the Presbytery to change that course; but the opportunity not having been given, the impression on Mr. Campbell's mind was, that he would need to use all caution in regard to conferring with a committee, whose nomination had such a seal put to it. The result is, his present determination as to which he is desirous to have this reason for it recorded, being aware of the ungracious appearance of declining to confer with a committee of his brethren, on any subject, however informal he might conceive their nomination to be. If Mr. Campbell had first heard of the appointment through the communication of the convener, he might have been expected, in fairness, to have assumed that, though irregular, it was in *kindness* to him that the usual procedure was departed from; but in the circumstances detailed it was impossible for Mr. Campbell to have that conviction.

2<sup>do</sup>. This may explain why Mr. Campbell, in the second place, declines upon the ground that he is referred to a memorial still lying on the Presbytery's table, and not yet considered, as the ground of marking him out from among his brethren, and calling him to a distance from his own home, to be examined upon his views of the doctrine and worship of a church of which he is a minister—bound to faithfulness to its interests by the highest obligations—for the nomination of a Committee for such an object, is itself a judicial act, as Mr. Campbell understands the form of process.

3<sup>io</sup>. Another consideration that weighs with Mr. Campbell is the rejection, without any notice even of its rejection, in the Presbytery's minute, of a memorial, or petition, numerous signed by his most respectable parishioners,

fitting to counteract the impression conveyed by that now on their table. These things Mr. Campbell begs to have stated, that he may not appear capricious or wayward, or disrespectful in declining to confer with his brethren; nor unnecessarily interfering with them in the discharge of their duties, as the guardians of religion; nor objecting to the legitimate use of the powers given them for that end—which he recognises, to which he has promised, and to which, in the strength of God, he hopes to be enabled to yield all due submission.

JOHN McLEOD CAMPBELL."

At the next meeting of Presbytery, on the 4th May, the foregoing minute, or report, of the committee appointed to converse with Mr. Campbell, and also his reasons for not conferring with the committee, were given in and read; and, after some discussion, the report of the committee was approved of by a majority.

Mr. Dunlop of Keppoch, Elder from Cardross, then moved that the memorial presented at last meeting of Presbytery in favour of Mr. Campbell, which, he said, although numerous and respectably signed by the parishioners of Row, the Presbytery had most unaccountably rejected, while they had received a petition against him without the least inquiry into the character of the petitioners. This motion was, after some conversation, agreed to, and the memorial was received and read.

Mr. Dunlop then, at considerable length, contended that, according to the form of process, before considering an accusation against a minister, the characters of the persons bringing the accusation ought to be inquired into. And he considered it still more the bounden duty of the Presbytery to investigate this

point, because of the character of the man against whom the present accusation was directed—"a man," he said, "whose character the breath of scandal had never touched—one who had really imbibed the spirit and temper of his Divine Master—one who truly had that wisdom which is from above, which is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits." He expressed his disapprobation of all the proceedings of the Presbytery in this case, and concluded with moving—"that seeing it is so important for the interests of religion that no charge be preferred lightly, or by improper, or incompetent, persons, against either the life or doctrine of a minister of the Gospel, that before any proceedings take place in consequence of this memorial against Mr. Campbell, the religious knowledge, and life and conversation of the petitioners be inquired into, as enjoined in the form of process, and that for this purpose the whole of the petitioners be cited to appear at the bar at next ordinary meeting of Presbytery." This motion was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Story.

Dr. Hamilton of Strathblane—"I agree most cordially with the greater part of what Mr. Dunlop has said respecting Mr. Campbell. I esteem Mr. Campbell as one of the worthiest of men; but just in proportion to my veneration for his character, am I vexed that there should be any ground given for an accusation against him. Nothing would delight me more than that before we part to-day, he and the memorialists were cordially united—that any thing he may have advanced inconsistent with the Scriptures should be relinquished by him; and that if his opponents are

in any darkness respecting his tenets, they should be enlightened, and that his usefulness should not be obstructed by any proceedings in the church courts; and, perhaps, if we go about the matter in the spirit of meekness and love, wonders may yet be wrought."

He contended that Mr. Dunlop's motion could not be acceded to—that to inquire into the religious knowledge or character of the memorialists, was quite incompetent, seeing that they were in communion with the church, which fact, of itself, testified both as to their knowledge and character.

The motion was opposed on the same ground by several members of court, and was withdrawn for a time.

The memorialists against Mr. Campbell were then called to the bar, upon which three of them appeared, and stated that they adhered to their memorial; and being asked whether they appeared only for themselves, or for themselves and the other memorialists, they answered that they had no authority from any of the others.

A lengthened discussion took place as to the propriety of putting some questions to these Memorialists, regarding the nature of the "unprofitable questions and obnoxious tenets" of which they complained, in order to ascertain whether or not they understood what they complained of, but this would not be permitted.

Mr. Campbell then stated, that, according to the constitution of the church, before a complaint can be preferred against a minister, those bringing the charge are bound to come and converse with their minister

upon the subject, and ask explanations. He stated that not one of the memorialists now in court had ever come to him, or had any communication with him on the subject. Two of the memorialists had had some conversation with him on the subject, but they were not present, and that was not a thing that one man could do for another. The form of process is very distinct on this subject,\* and the principle of it is, that nothing is to be done which may tend to injure the character of a minister, without the greatest caution. That the duty of complainers to converse with their minister relative to the complaint they purposed to bring against him, was binding on each of them *individually*. It was not a matter that one could do by deputy, as it was a matter in which their consciences must be concerned, and not a mere matter of form—it was not like serving a notice, but it was in order that if their minister should be able to satisfy them, or to convince them that they were wrong, they should never bring forward the complaint.

\* 3. And because a scandal committed by a minister hath on these accounts many aggravations, and once raised, though it may be found to be without any ground, yet it is not easily wiped of; therefore a presbytery should exactly *ponder by whose information and complaint it comes first before them*; and a presbytery is not so far to receive the information, as to proceed to the citation of a minister, or any way begin the process, until there be first some person, who under his hand gives in the complaint with some account of its probability, and undertakes to make out the libel.

4 All Christians ought to be so prudent and wary in accusing ministers of any censurable fault, as that they ought neither to publish nor spread the same, *nor accuse the minister before the presbytery without first acquainting the minister himself if they can have access thereto*, and then if need be, some of the most prudent of the ministers and elders of that presbytery. and their advice got in the affair. — *Form of Process*, chap. vii.

Dr. Graham and Dr. Hamilton contended that the purpose of this requirement was merely that the minister might have notice of their intention, so as not to be taken unawares, and that this had been fulfilled, inasmuch as Mr. Campbell had admitted that two of the memorialists had conversed with him on the subject; and Dr. G. made a motion, to the following purport:—"The Presbytery, after mature deliberation, find that said memorial contains a serious charge against Mr. Campbell, and resolve to ask the memorialists whether they are willing to convert their memorial into a libel, under all the pains thereof." This motion having been seconded, Mr. Dunlop made a motion to the following effect:—"Seeing it is so important both for the interests of religion, and for the security of the reputation of the ministers of the Church, that no charge should be preferred lightly against the life or doctrine of a minister; that, previous to founding any further proceedings on the memorial now on the table, the petitioners be required to state, whether they have complied with the requirements of the fourth section of the seventh chapter of the Form of Process; and after they shall have answered in the affirmative, that their religious knowledge, and lives and conversation, as well as their preparedness to substantiate the libel, be diligently and strictly inquired into, as enjoined in the Form of Process; and that, for this purpose, the whole of them be cited to appear at this bar, next meeting of Presbytery.

Both motions having been put to the vote, Dr. Graham's motion was carried—seven voting for it, and two for Mr. Dunlop's.



From this resolution Mr. Dunlop dissented, and complained to the ensuing General Assembly, to which dissent and complaint Mr. Story adhered.

Before the case came to be heard in the Assembly, the complainers against the resolution of the Presbytery were informed, on consulting counsel, that their complaint was not good, as it would have been quite competent to have brought forward their motion *after* the Presbytery had put the question to the memorialists which they had resolved to put; and also, that, although the Form of Process was very explicit on the point, it was very doubtful whether it would not be held that the practice was different; and, therefore, it was resolved to withdraw the complaint.

At this sitting of the Assembly several members spoke at considerable length against Mr. Campbell, but as, at the time, it appeared to many scarcely fair or decorous to attack a person who was not properly before the Assembly, and who could not be permitted, at that stage of the proceedings, to say a word in his own defence, the compiler will simply give the minute of the General Assembly on the subject, as it appears in the following record of the next meeting of the Presbytery of Dumbarton.

At Dumbarton, the fifteenth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years, which day the Presbytery met and was duly constituted:

(*Inter alia.*) Dr. Graham produced an extract of the judgment of the General Assembly, in the appeal of Mr. Dunlop and others, relative to the case of Row, the tenor whereof follows, viz. :—

At Edinburgh, Wednesday, the twenty-sixth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years.

Session sixth,

Which day the General Assembly of the Church of Scot-

land had transmitted to them, by their Committee of Bills, petition from Alexander Dunlop, Esquire, and others, dissenters and complainers against a sentence of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, resolving to call to their bar certain parishioners of Row, preferring a complaint against Mr. Campbell, minister of that parish, as having preached certain unsound doctrines.

The minutes having been read, parties were called. Compeared Mr. Story, one of the complainers, with Henry Cockburn, Esquire, Advocate, as counsel for him and the other complainers, and also as counsel for certain parishioners, who had petitioned the Presbytery in favour of Mr. Campbell, their minister.

For the Presbytery, Dr. Graham, Dr. Hamilton, Dr. Fleming, and Mr. Coltart: and for the parishioners complaining against Mr. Campbell, George M'Lellan, Aulay Lennox, and Peter Turner, three of their number.

Mr. Cockburn, in name of the complainers, craved leave to withdraw the complaint: and the members appearing for the Presbytery, signified their willingness to acquiesce in this proposal, on certain conditions. After reasoning, the General Assembly unanimously grant permission to the complainers to withdraw their complaint—and considering the vital importance of the subject, and that the doctrines imputed to Mr. Campbell, in the memorial presented to the Presbytery, have been condemned by the General Assembly in seventeen hundred and twenty years, and are directly opposed to the word of God, and the standards of this Church, remit this case to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, with instructions that they receive any libel which may be presented to them by the petitioners from the parish of Row, or proceed otherwise in the investigation of the charges against Mr. Campbell as they shall deem just, and for edification, according to the rules of the Church, and that they carry on their proceedings till the cause is ripe for a final judgment, notwithstanding any appeal or complaint on preliminary points.

Parties having been called in, this judgment was intimated to them. Whereupon Dr. Graham, in name of the Presbytery, took instruments and craved extracts.

Extracted from the records of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by

(Signed), JOHN LEE, *Cl. Eccl. Scot.*

The Presbytery agreed to call the memorialists from the parish of Row to the bar.

Compeared, Messrs. Parlan M'Farlan, George M'Lellan, Peter Turner, John Thomson, James Cochran, Peter Cochran, and A. Lennox.

The memorialists were then asked, whether they were willing to convert their said memorial into a libel, which they declared they were willing to do.

The memorialists were also asked whether they had, previous to the presentation of their complaint, acquainted Mr. Campbell of their intention to complain to the Presbytery of his doctrine—when they declared that two of them, in the name of the rest, had waited on him for that purpose.

It was moved and seconded, that the Presbytery should hold a parochial visitation of the parish of Row, on Thursday the eighth day of July, at half-past eleven o'clock, and require the minister of the parish to preach at that time and place, on his ordinary text: and further, appoint the Moderator to preach there on Sabbath the twenty-seventh current, and intimate the same from the pulpit after forenoon's service, and summon the minister, heritors, elders, and heads of families, to attend the presbytery thereafter, and acquaint them with the state of that kirk and congregation in every point; and if any of them have certain knowledge of any thing amiss in their minister, that they do then acquaint the presbytery therewith:—which was unanimously agreed to.

At this meeting Mr. Campbell asked, whether at the visitation it would be open to inquire into the characters of the memorialists, and was told that no such inquiry could be entered upon, as they were all in full communion with the church of Row.

Agrecably to this resolution, the Presbytery held a parochial visitation in the church of Row; Mr. Campbell preached before the Presbytery, from Matthew v. 1—12, a sermon, which was afterwards published from a short-hand writer's notes.

The Presbytery meeting, on this occasion, was held

with closed doors; but we have reason to believe that the following account of what took place, extracted from the Greenock Advertiser of 23d July, is substantially correct.

The Presbytery was constituted in the session house; after which, a report of a Committee appointed at last meeting to search for precedents, as to the proper manner of conducting the visitation, was read and approved of. After this, several of the members asked Mr. Campbell how long he proposed to preach, as he must fix a time. He replied, he thought it would take three hours to give what he would feel it needful to say on the subject from which he was to preach. He was told that they would not hear him above an hour, and that if he would not limit himself to a reasonable time, they would instruct the Moderator to stop him. Mr. C. begged that he might not be limited; and said, that especially as they were to judge the sermon, he ought not to be hindered from bringing out his meaning fully to prevent misconception. To this it was replied, that they did not come there to judge of a sermon—that his preaching at that time was a mere matter of form, and that his case would be neither better nor worse for his sermon. After a good deal of discussion, it was agreed that the whole services should not, if possible, occupy more than two hours.

The Presbytery then proceeded to the church. After Mr. Campbell had concluded the service, the Moderator intimated from the pulpit that the Presbytery would adjourn to the session-house, and invited the elders and those who had signed the memorial against Mr. Campbell, to meet with them there.

Before either the elders or memorialists were admitted, the Presbytery proceeded to discuss the merits of the sermon they had just heard. Some objected, that the sermon ought not to be judged of at all, for having limited Mr. C. as to the time he was to occupy, no judgment, in fairness, could be passed upon it—we have learned, however, that the Presbytery, by a great majority, recorded their detestation and abhorrence of the doctrine contained in two sentences in the sermon, which we believe are to the following purport—“God loves every child of Adam with a love the measure of which is to

be seen in the agonies of Christ ;” and that “ the person who knows that Christ died for every child of Adam, is the person who is in the condition to say to every human being, Let there be peace with you, peace between you and your God.”

The minister having been removed, the elders were first examined. Several of the memorialists were then called in, one after another, by name, and questioned as to the nature of the heretical doctrines of which they had complained in their minister. After the parties were removed, we understand that a motion to the following purport was carried by a great majority—that the Presbytery recommend the memorialists to convert their memorial into a libel, and present it, with a list of witnesses, at the ordinary meeting of the Presbytery in September.

Mr. Dunlop, of Keppoch, opposed the motion, in a speech of which we regret we can only give an outline.

He began by vindicating himself from a virulent attack which, he said, had been made on him at the last meeting of Presbytery, from which he was absent. He went on to say, that it had been asserted, that he had adopted the line of conduct he had pursued, in the case now before them, for the purpose of preventing inquiry or creating delay. He said that this was utterly false—that he only desired to see the inquiry conducted as gentlemen and Christians ought to conduct it—and that so far from being an enemy to inquiry, it would give him great satisfaction that parochial visitations should take place in every parish within the bounds of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr—and he expressed his conviction, that a tenth part of the pains that had been taken to get up the petition which had brought them together, would bring memorials from many of the parishes, and abundance of evidence, not only of most improper doctrine preached by many of the ministers, but of great impropriety in their tempers, lives, and conversation.

With respect to the recommendation proposed to be given to the memorialists—he remarked that they had at last meeting agreed to convert their memorial into a libel, under a *guarantee* from certain members of Presbytery, *that the libellers should not be permitted to get themselves into a scrape.* This he considered was a most extraordinary arrangement between judges and parties before them. He not only conceived that no man could honestly act both as ac-

cuser and judge, but that an honest judge could have no private communication with parties—urge them to bring forward a suit—advise them how to carry it on—or give them a guarantee against any bad consequences from their doing so. He asked, what would be said of a judge in the court of session, who would come into a district of the country, advise certain parties to bring an action before that court, assure them that they had only to bring an action, and they should have no farther trouble, and might be assured of success—or what would be thought of judges who, after an action was brought before their court, permitted private interviews, at their houses and elsewhere, with one of the parties, and gave them their assistance and advice as to the way of carrying on their action? Unquestionably such conduct would cause such an outcry in this country, that such judges must lose their seats on the bench. Mr. Dunlop then asked *whether any member of the Presbytery of Dumbarton* had come into the parish of Row, and had urged the parishioners to petition the Presbytery against their minister, assuring them that they had only to petition, and that the Presbytery would manage the business without giving them any farther trouble? He farther asked, whether there were not *several members* of Presbytery who, *after* the petition had come before them, had had private communication with the petitioners, advised them as to their proceedings, and even concocted along with them the proceedings of that day? He said, if any of them had acted in such a way, he must object to such persons sitting as judges in the case. He mentioned that he knew well how unpleasant it was to some of the members that he should be there. He said he knew well the attempt some of them had made to induce the session of Cardross not to send him there as their representative. He had no doubt the attempt would be repeated, and perhaps successfully; but, while he was there, he must raise his voice in the cause of truth and justice, and therefore could not vote for recommending a libel under such circumstances. No reply was made to Mr. Dunlop's speech, and the decision of the Presbytery having been intimated to the parties, the Presbytery dispersed about 9 o'clock, P.M.

At the next meeting of Presbytery, in the first

week of September, a libel, which will be found at a subsequent part of this volume, was accordingly brought forward by eight of the individuals who had subscribed the memorial which had given rise to the proceedings already recorded. The name of the short-hand writer employed to record these proceedings, having been included in the list of witnesses for proving the libel, he was not allowed to remain in the court, at this and some other meetings of the Presbytery, and in consequence of this, no account can be given of what passed at this meeting. We understand, however, that the resolution which the Presbytery came to, to receive and serve this libel on Mr. Campbell, was opposed by the Rev. Mr. Story of Roseneath; who contended that the libel was not sufficiently explicit, and that the terms in which this charge was couched, might be understood in a sense neither contrary to the Scriptures, nor the standards of the Church. All the other members of Presbytery who were present, took a different view of the libel; and Mr. Campbell, was accordingly summoned to appear before the Presbytery at their next meeting on the 21st September.

The following account of the meeting of Presbytery, on the 21st September, is taken from the notes of another short-hand writer who was present. At the meetings of the 22d September and 5th October, no short-hand writer was present, so that the minutes of Presbytery, which will appear at their proper place, contain all that can be given respecting these meetings.

The parties in this case having been called to the

bar, the libel was read, and then Mr. Campbell's written answers to the libel were also read. Mr. M'George, agent for the libellers, spoke nearly as follows :

“ Mr. Campbell has made certain admissions of the minor proposition in the libel ; but before adverting to these, I must speak as to the relevancy, because I must first crave the judgment of the Presbytery on that point. And to this point I address myself with diffidence and anxiety, not on account of any difficulty in it, as it appears simple and clear, but on account of the novelty of my situation. This is a question of rare occurrence, solemn in its nature, and one that must excite very great reflection at all times. The defender is, I believe, a gentleman of unblemished life, of respectable talents, and of acknowledged zeal in the discharge of his ministerial functions. A prosecution against such a man for erroneous opinions, is a very delicate and responsible duty, but still it is a duty, and the very circumstances to which I allude, seem to render it more imperative. When error, Sir, is propagated with zeal, and rendered plausible by talents, and when there is no antidote in the party by whom it is promulgated, it then peculiarly tends to excite confusion and disorder in the Church ; and the truth of this remark is but too fully verified by the state of the parish of Row. My clients therefore would have disregarded the convictions of their consciences, had they not placed Mr. C. at your bar.

This is a question of libel against a minister of the established Church, for promulgating doctrines in opposition to the Sacred Scriptures and the Confession of Faith ; and the question for you to decide, is the relevancy of the libel. In establishing that point, I am not called upon at all, according to my conception, to enter on the wide field of Scripture controversy ; that this doctrine is at variance with Scripture, I shall take leave to hold as true, if it is at variance with the Confession of Faith. I do not apprehend that the Reverend Presbytery will permit the standards of the Church to be called in question by one of her ministers, as not in accordance with Scripture, or to be opposed by other authorities not recognised by the Church ; to entertain such arguments



would be a dereliction of principle. As to the authority to which a minister of the Church of Scotland is subject, there can be no doubt; but before going farther, it may be well to set this matter at rest. When a minister is ordained, among other questions which must be answered by him is the following: "Do you sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith, approved by the General Assemblies of this Church, and ratified by law in the year 1690, to be founded upon the word of God? And do you acknowledge the same as the confession of your faith; and will you firmly and constantly adhere thereto, and, to the utmost of your power, assert, maintain, and defend the same, and the purity of worship as presently practised in this national Church, and asserted in the 15th Act of Assembly, 1707?" And by the same Act, such as after trial are approved of, are appointed to sign a formula in these terms, "I do hereby declare, that I do sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith, approved by the General Assemblies, of this national Church, and ratified by law in the year 1690, and frequently confirmed by diverse Acts of Parliament since that time, to be the truths of God. And I do own the same as the Confession of my Faith."

Now, Sir, in considering the relevancy of the libel against a minister, who, at his ordination answered these questions affirmatively, and subscribed this formula, I am persuaded that the Presbytery will consider any detailed reference to the Scriptures altogether unnecessary.

With the Confession of Faith the reverend members of this Court must be much better acquainted than I am; but as it will be expected, I shall take the liberty of quoting a few passages, in order to show that the doctrines alluded to in the libel are contrary to it. The doctrines charged as erroneous, are two; 1st, That of Universal Atonement and Pardon; and 2dly, That Assurance is of the Essence of Faith and necessary to Salvation. Regarding the first of these, the Confession of Faith, is extremely explicit; and though Mr. Campbell has quoted some of the passages, which I shall now read, *with comments*, I shall feel it unnecessary to do so before this Court.

Mr. M'George then read the following passages from the Confession of Faith: "Chap. iii. section 6th and 7th; chap.

vi. sect. 6th ; chap. viii. sect. 1st and 5th ; chap. x. sect. 1st ; chap. xi. sect. 1st and 5th ; chap. xv. sect. 3d, 4th, and 6th. There is one fact charged in the libel which, in express terms, sets the doctrine of the Church of Scotland at nought ; part of the 7th count relating to the sermon preached at Row, on the 4th July, 1830. " And on the same occasion you said that the doctrine of the Church of Scotland tended to fatalism."

The second doctrine charged against Mr. Campbell is, that Assurance is of the Essence of Faith, and necessary to salvation.

This point is likewise condemned in the Confession of Faith. (Mr. M'George then read) Chap. xiv. sect. 3d ; chap. xviii. sect. 3d and 4th. Then, Sir, as to the Act of Assembly 1720, I should think it quite unnecessary to defend the authority of that Act on which Mr. C. has made various observations. It is considered as the authoritative declaration of the opinions of the Church of Scotland, and will undoubtedly be received with respect in this Presbytery. (Mr. M'G. then read the Act.) Now, Moderator, it is upon these express propositions of the Confession of Faith, and this judgment of the General Assembly, that I found the relevancy of the libel. I consider it unnecessary to detain the Court, and expect that the Presbytery will find the libel relevant. Mr. C., in his able defence, has acknowledged the minor proposition qualified in certain respects ; but the major proposition he has admitted in as many words. There are explanations given of the doctrine of universal pardon, but none of universal atonement ; I should therefore think that a proof from witnesses is unnecessary. If I understand the defence, it substantially admits the doctrines imputed to Mr. Campbell, but denies the relevancy of the charges ; but I am perhaps anticipating, for the first duty of the Presbytery is to consider whether the libel, if made out, is sufficient to infer the conclusion.

Mr. Campbell. I do not expect to add any thing of importance to what I have already stated ; but seeing that it resolves itself so entirely into a question of relevancy, I am very desirous that the ground on which I deny the relevancy be distinctly apprehended. I did not utter a syllable that had the least air of casting discredit on the Standards ; but

the Act of 1720, I regard with regret, and, as a minister of this Church, have cause to be humbled on account of it.

Mr. Campbell then shortly explained the grounds of his objections to the relevancy, in as far as they referred to the Standards, and the Act of the General Assembly of 1720. He said that had he been libelled for denying the doctrine of election, Mr. M'George's arguments would have been quite relevant against him; but, as he did not deny it, but on the contrary held it freely and fully, that he did not feel that they applied to him.

Mr. M'George then rose, and observed, that the authority of the Act of Assembly of 1720, could not, in the present case, be doubted, as the Assembly of 1830 had, in their remit to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, expressly referred to it; to which Mr. Campbell replied that, the principle of "an Act of any single Assembly **not** being a law of the Church" being applicable to them all, the remit of the Assembly of 1830 could not be regarded in any other light.

The Church-officer then, by the command of the Moderator, declared the parties to be removed from the bar.

The Moderator next called for any observations on the relevancy of the libel laid on the table.

The Rev. Dr. Graham, of Killearn, went at considerable length over the different doctrines libelled, and contended that they were contrary both to the Scriptures and the Standards; and concluded by moving that the Presbytery find the major proposition of the libel relevant.\*

The Rev. Dr. Hamilton, of Strathblane.

"It is with great pain that I must now address you, in such a case as this; it would have been more delightful to have been co-operating with my brother. The defence he has made corroborates the statements of the counsel at the bar—he admits that he holds the doctrines in a certain sense. It is possible if you take detached sentences of Scripture to

\* The Rev. Dr.'s speech is not reported here, because it was found on comparison, that it is, to a considerable extent, the same, word for word, with his speech at the bar of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, already printed, and given at a subsequent part of this record.

fasten on it any sentiments you please. If you read any book, and look at one part of it and not at other parts of it, any degree of nonsense may be found in it. Look at one part of the Bible, and it is said there, that the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God; look to another part and you will find it said, that the whole world lieth in wickedness; stop there, and the conclusion is irresistible that the whole world shall be turned into hell. But if I come to the Scriptures in a proper manner, I must renounce the doctrines my young brother has this day advanced. We must not go back to any confession before the Westminster Confession, for to it we must bow. By my subscription, I am bound to receive the Bible in the sense of the Westminster Confession. I am looking at the Confession used in the English church at Geneva, and here I see the language that was quoted 'to purge the sins of all the world; but when I look to another part of the same Confession, I find these words, 'to all them that believe.' This universal redemption, then, is limited to all them that believe. And, in another part, I find, "which Church is not seen to man's eye, but only known to God, who of the lost sonnes of Adam hath ordained some, as vessels of wrath, to damnation." If there is any difference between light and darkness, life and death, the man who holds the doctrine of reprobation, cannot hold the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon. Were there no other thing than this count in the libel, 'This doctrine of our Church leads to fatalism,' this would be sufficient to condemn the preacher. Our Standards maintain that Christ is the only Redeemer, but to say that for this reason all are pardoned, is just as absurd as saying, that because there is a road from Britain to France, therefore, all the inhabitants go to France.

Mr. Campbell's doctrine, regarding assurance, is at variance with our Standards, for he reprobates the idea of a man looking into himself for his interest in Christ. But I disdain all reference to the previous confessions to interpret our present one, which was received as being in nothing contrary to them: it holds that comfort is to be obtained from grace within us; and in the 80th, the 167th, and 172d questions of the Larger Catechism, we find the same doctrine, and, likewise, that our assurance increases as our holiness increases. This, I think, may be sufficient on the subject of

assurance; as to the tenet of universal redemption, I shall merely read to you the 59th question of the Larger Catechism, in addition to what has been stated at the bar.

(Dr. H. here entered into a minute consideration of the language of the Standards of the Church of Scotland, which he said was that of "offering salvation and grace to sinners;" in illustration of this, he referred to the 67th and 68th questions of the Larger Catechism, and then proceeded as follows:)

I shall merely mention one passage more, the 32d question. I have many more marked, but with these I need not trouble you.

We find, through the whole of the sacred volume, if the Lord has a people, the serpent has one also; we find at the very opening of the sacred canon, there was enmity to be placed between the seed of the woman and that of the serpent; we trace this opposition through the whole of the Old Testament, and also through the New.

I hold in my hand a letter, in which a licentiate of this Church tendered his resignation. (Dr. H. then read the letter, in which it was stated, that the individual regarded the 6th section of the 3d chapter of the Confession of Faith, (in which it is stated, that none other are redeemed by Christ but the elect only,) as denying part of the truth of God, and that this appeared to him to be contrary to the plainest declarations of Scripture, in which it is said, that he died for all; and that, for this reason, he desired to tender his license to the Presbytery.) This individual, continued Dr. H. found it to be his duty to leave the Church on the very grounds on which our friend finds it to be his to remain. However unwilling I am, I must declare the libel relevant, and that we ought to take proper measures to establish the truth of the minor proposition."

The Rev. Mr. Gregor, of Bonhill.

"I will not find any great difficulty in stringing a few sentences together. I expected that Mr. Campbell would have wrought a very desirable reformation in the parish of Row. His talents are most respectable—of his zeal I never had a doubt: the last sermon I heard from him but one, I heard with great pleasure; there was a degree of talent and genius in it, which, in a sermon, is not misplaced. Our hearers are better judges of what we set before them than

we are aware of: they understand the subject as well as we do—they know when they are well served and ill served—but the last sermon I heard from him, I heard with pain; there was a degree of ingenuity in it, but it was applied to twist the word of God. Some of us might have been his father; and, without any great arrogance, I may say, that we had as much divinity as he has before he was born; and we may be allowed to have made some addition to it during the thirty years he has been in the world.

We are far from appealing to the word of God on this ground; it is by the Confession of Faith that we must stand; by it we hold our livings. I might just as well judge of any Act of Parliament, by the speeches made on both sides of the question, as proceed, as Mr. Campbell has done, in referring to the previous Confessions: as well might a minister refer to the decrees of the Council of Trent. If we can say, that Mr. Campbell's opinions are inconsistent with the Confession of Faith, we must come to a most painful and distressing conclusion; we must hold the doctrine libellous. Mr. Campbell has not to come and tell us now what the Bible says. When the Presbytery of Dumbarton inducted him into his living, he subscribed the Confession of Faith, with the most august ceremonies of religion; and the parish has a right to have the Scriptures interpreted according to the Confession of Faith. I have no doubt as to the course we ought to pursue, and conclude with finding the libel relevant."

The Rev. Mr. Proudfoot, of Arrochar.

"It will be necessary for me to make but a very few remarks. It is with very great pain that I rise on this occasion. I have had much intercourse with Mr. Campbell, and I regarded him as a dear brother in the Lord; but the tenets he now holds are inconsistent with the Confession of Faith, and with something still higher—that from which it derives its authority—the faithful record of the Amen. I, therefore, hold, that there is no difficulty at all; for I believe, that if any opinions are distinctly condemned by the Standards of our Church, these are of Mr. Campbell's. I have no hesitation in admitting, that assurance is what a believer may attain to; but I would tremble to say, that no man is a believer but he who has assurance at all times and in all cir-

cumstances. As to universal pardon, although I would not say that I would judge of a doctrine by the consequences of the doctrine, yet, from my own observation, I have been led to conclude, that it is tending to break down the defences of morality. I have, therefore, a duty which, as a minister, I must fearlessly discharge. I sit down, Sir, with pain, when I reflect on the time in which I have enjoyed hallowed and blissful intercourse with Mr. Campbell ; but the doctrines he now holds are contrary to the Standards of the Church which I have sworn to uphold till the last breath of my existence. I have nothing further to say, but to conclude with finding the libel relevant."

The Rev. Mr. Story, of Roseneath.

"At last meeting, Sir, I dissented from the finding of the Reverend Court, on the ground, recorded in your minutes, that it did not contain specifically libellous matter. After hearing Mr. Campbell's explanations, I am still of the same opinion. The libel accuses Mr. Campbell of teaching doctrines contrary to the *Scriptures* and to the Standards; it will, therefore, not do to say, that we have nothing to do with the *Scriptures*; for I hold that it was, therefore, necessary for Mr. Campbell to prove, that his doctrines were consistent with Scripture. I have been surprised that none of the brethren have adverted to the candour with which he has treated the Presbytery. Instead of putting them to trouble, he has come forward and candidly confessed what he does hold. This should have drawn forth the warmest admiration. Of the nature of that defence, Sir, I was ignorant, until I heard it read this day; and, in justice to Mr. Campbell, I may add, there was not one word of it composed on Thursday last. Had I been his counselor, I would not have given him such counsel as he has followed. Some of his parishioners have brought a charge against him; as a pastor, it became him to require a specific charge. I, for one, would have listened for hours, had you entered into the matter. I will, therefore, claim what I would willingly have granted to another; for, to say little is to say nothing.

The fundamental question is, does God hate or love his creatures. A reverend father, well qualified to speak on this subject, alluded to the subject of reprobation. Is this

decisive of God hating his creatures? If so, then I hesitate not to say, that I would renounce the Standards as contrary to the gospel. I say that it is contrary to all natural religion, to say that the infinite mind hates any of its creatures. The question is, has God expressed his love to all his creatures? Is there a man, woman, or child to whom God has not exhibited some kindness? Is there a man here who could venture to say, that there has existed a being to whom God has not shown some kindness? The question then is, what is the kindness God is ever manifesting? And I adopt Dr. Graham's rule of interpretation, that Scripture cannot contradict itself. 'If God endured with much long-suffering, the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction.' Did these vessels of wrath never experience his kindness? I hold that no sinner has a right to exist in the universe of God;—I hold that Adam, the moment he sinned, did not merit a moment's existence; **why, then,** was he permitted to exist, but in virtue of the mediation of Christ? There must, then, be some connexion between Adam and the whole human race—in his body were contained the elements of all future generations; I say more, I say that in him was contained that which entered into the constitution of our Lord's humanity; there, then, is a fundamental point. The question to which I am speaking is not, are all men pardoned? but is there any man, woman, or child, that has no connexion with Christ? Is there any one that has *merited* kindness from God? most unquestionably not. The only channel, then, through which such kindness could flow, is through Christ. I beseech you to observe, that the very existence of Adam, after sinning, depended on the fact that the Son of God should die in his nature.

As it is late, I must refer but shortly to the Standards. If Adam had been dealt with according to his iniquities, what would he have met with? He would have met with no kindness from God. Now, it is a first principle that the Holy Spirit holds communication with the sons of men only through the work of the Lord Jesus Christ; and if his work be limited to the elect, there could be no communication between the Holy Spirit and the non-elect. Now, the Confession is quite explicit on this point, that there are influences of the Spirit exerted on those that are non-elect. (Chap. x. 4.)



Now, you will observe, that I hold this principle described in this portion of the Confession to be identical with the truth that our Saviour has a connexion with all men who have descended from Adam—call it atonement, call it pardon, call it any thing. I will never cease to teach what I know many around me teach, that there is a connexion between every man and Christ ; I hold that the very same blood which flows in the veins of the most reprobate—(Mr. Story was here interrupted by the Moderator)—what I mean to say is, that there is a connexion between Christ and every person of Adam's race, which does not exist between him and other races of beings. It must be seen, therefore, that in the explanation given of what Mr. Campbell teaches, I hold that there is nothing contrary to the principles I have laid down, or to the Confession of Faith, which I am ready to declare to be the confession of my faith ; for in it you have certainly no contradiction of these principles.

But with regard to the other point libelled, in the major proposition ; there is in the libel obviously a misconception as to the assurance of faith. The distinction drawn in the answers to the libel, and in the Confession, is most distinctly that there is a difference between the assurance of faith and the assurance of personal salvation. Mr. C. declared this last to be not so of the essence of faith as to be ever present with the believer, but that an assurance of the object of faith is essential to faith. Now, I hold that this is the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, and of all who are regarded as of authority in these matters. For example, the words of Patrick Hamilton, the martyr, are, “ They that believe not that their sins are forgiven them for Christ's sake they believe not the gospel.” This is strongly recommended by John Knox, who is the channel of its communication to the Church.

“ My sure belief that God both may and will save me ” is the answer to the question, What is faith, in Melville's Catechism.

What is the right faith ? “ It is a *sure persuasion* and steadfast knowledge of God's tender love toward us,” &c. Calvin's Catech., Quest. 111th. “ A sure persuasion of the heart, that Christ by his death hath taken away our sins,” is the answer given to the same question in Davidson's Cate-

Chism, which was approved of by an Assembly of this Church.

As to the Act of 1720, it is contrary to the constitution of the Church that such an Act should have a power that no other Act of Assembly had. In proof of this I may refer to the opinion of the very highest authorities of the Church on this point, (Mr. Story then quoted the language of Dr. Thomson, Dr. Burns, and of Boston on this subject, who all condemned the Act; which he said they could not have done had it been a law of the Church.)

Seeing, then, that there does exist a connexion between Christ and the children of men previous to their believing,—“for God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us”—this connexion then must have existed anterior to our believing; there is nothing therefore contained in this charge contrary to any fundamental principle of religion, or to our Standards; seeing that this is the principle laid down in these answers, and also that a man must be assured of what God says, I would, on sitting down, entreat of this house, before coming to any resolution, to investigate the matter more thoroughly.

The Rev. Mr. Sym, of New Kilpatrick.

Every court of judgment must have a law according to which its judgments are pronounced; and the Confession of Faith, according to which I am a minister of this Church, gives me an interpretation of that law. The Church has bound me down to a particular interpretation of the Confession, for I hold that the Act of 1720 is still binding on us here, after all that has been said; and the remit from the Assembly, 1830, prevents me from going beyond the simple ground that the doctrine of universal pardon, and that assurance is of the essence of faith, are contrary to the Standards. Mr. Story might surely have had more knowledge of church matters than to endeavour to do away with the force of the Act of 1720. He must surely have known the distinction between Acts declaratory and Acts legislative.

In the case of an Act declaratory, it is not essential that it be transmitted to Presbyteries; that of 1720 is of this description, and the ground therefore remains quite unshaken, that this doctrine is contrary to our Standards. It is unnecessary to detain you at this late hour, I beg merely

to say, that on hearing this libel read over, and comparing the major with the minor proposition, and again on hearing Mr. Campbell declare that he believed in and taught the doctrine of universal pardon, and that of assurance of faith being necessary to salvation ; on hearing all this I believe that there will be no difficulty in our finding the relevancy of the libel ; and I conceive that we have nothing to do but to take this voluminous document (the answers) into our serious consideration, and that there will be no occasion for bringing any witnesses here.

The Rev. Mr. Niven, of Balfron, made a number of objections to the libel, in point of form, and, after stating these at some length, proposed that they should remit the case to the Assembly as it then stood, as Mr. Campbell, in his defence, had confessed that he held opinions which, in Mr. N.'s estimation were contrary to the Standards of the Church, and were even worse than any thing in the libel.

The Rev. Dr. Fleming, of Old Kilpatrick, observed, that of the three kinds of acts in the Church, two did not require the approbation of a majority of Presbyteries, which was necessary only in the case of statute acts, to which class that of 1720 did not belong ; and he maintained, that for this reason that act had the force of a law. Besides he affirmed that the subject of this act had been the result of mature deliberation, and had been before the Church for many years previously ; on this ground he found the libel relevant.

Alex. Dunlop, Esq., elder from Cardross, was of opinion that the doctrines of Mr. Campbell, as explained in his answers, were neither contrary to Scripture, nor to the Confession of Faith, and therefore he held the libel not to be relevant.

After a few observations from another of the elders, the question was put by the Moderator—"Is the libel relevant or irrelevant?" when all the members voted "relevant," with the exception of the Rev. Mr. Story and Mr. Dunlop ; against which decision Mr. Campbell entered his protest.

Of the meetings of Presbytery on the 22d September, 5th October, and 7th December, we are, at present, unable to give any account beyond what appears in the Presbytery record; extracts from which will be found after the libel and answers. An abridged account of the proceedings at the meeting of Presbytery, on the 29th March, 1831, will be given as an appendix to the proceedings in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, the short-hand writer's report of it not having been received in time to admit of its being given at its proper place.

The Compiler cannot but regret the disjointed and irregular appearance which this volume must have, partly in consequence of the hurried manner in which it was necessary that it should be got up, but chiefly on account of the peculiar circumstances (which it is unnecessary to detail) under which those parts of it, extracted from the Presbytery record, had to be printed. He trusts, however, that he has been enabled (as he is sure it has been his earnest desire) to give a fair and impartial account of all the proceedings in this important case, up to the reference to the Assembly by the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr; and he hopes to complete this record by giving, as soon as possible after the sitting of the ensuing General Assembly, as a supplement to this volume, a full and accurate report of all the proceedings in this case before that venerable body.

If any shall be led by the perusal of this record to consider more seriously and prayerfully, than they ever yet have done, what is the truth of God—if, by the perusal of these discussions, any be shaken out of

their confidence in the opinions of men, and be made to search the Scriptures of truth, to find out for themselves “ what they are to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man,” the Compiler will consider himself abundantly rewarded for his labour.

Greenock, 14th May, 1831.

LIBEL, &c.

---



MR JOHN MACLEOD CAMPBELL, Minister of the Gospel at Row, You are indicted and accused this seventh day of September, eighteen hundred and thirty, by the subscribers, heads of families, and inhabitants of the said parish, That albeit the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, as also the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, are contrary to the Holy Scriptures and to the Confession of Faith approved by the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, and ratified by law in the year sixteen hundred and ninety; and were moreover condemned by the fifth Act of the General Assembly held in the year seventeen hundred and twenty, as being directly opposed to the word of God, and to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Church of Scotland: Yet true it is and of verity, that you the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell hold and have repeatedly promulgated and expressed the foresaid doctrines from the pulpit or other place or places from which you delivered discourses, as also in conversation, in your addresses to communicants at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and in your ministerial visitations of families within your parish: In so far as on various occasions during the course of the last twelve months, you the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell have declared that God has forgiven the sins of all mankind whether they believe it or not: That in consequence of the death of Christ, the sins

of every individual of the human race are forgiven : That it is sinful and absurd to pray for an interest in Christ, because all mankind have an interest in Christ already : And that no man is a Christian unless he is positively assured of his own salvation : And more particularly :

*First*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a sermon preached by you in the Floating Chapel at Greenock on the twenty-eighth day of April, eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month or of March immediately preceding, or May immediately following, used the following expressions, or at least expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet* : " Before I can say to any man fear God and give him glory, I must know that his condemnation is taken away, and his sins forgiven ;" And again, " It is a fact at this moment of every person present that his sins are put away, and if I did not know this, I could not say to you fear God and give him glory, because it would be an impossibility : " And again, " I could not conceive any thing I could ask of God which he has not told me that he has already given me : " And again, " Christ's right to judge men is that he has redeemed them : " And again, " Judgment pre-supposes our forgiveness." And again, " It is as persons who have been forgiven that we shall be judged : " And again, " We cannot repent and give God glory unless we now have forgiveness : " And again, " There could be no judgment to come, unless there had been pardon to come."

*Secondly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell in a sermon preached by you at Row, on the eighth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, in presence of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, being the day on which the said Presbytery held a parochial visitation of the parish of Row, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or of August immediately following, used the following expressions, or at least expressions of a similar

import and tendency, *videlicet*, "That he alone bore the character of peace-maker who knew that Christ died for every human being:" And again, in speaking of the love of God, you said, "That that love to every individual of Adam's family was equal or according to the agonies of the Son of God:" And again, in speaking of the words in the fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel, "Blessed are they that mourn," you said, "that the causes of this mourning were not within the believer, his sins having been taken away, but they existed outwardly in the unbelief and sinfulness of the world."

*Thirdly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a Sermon preached by you in the School-house at Helensburgh, on one of the days of the month of October eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, used the following expression or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*: "That it was a gross error in the modern preachers of evangelical doctrines to maintain that the reason why men were not cured was that they did not seek an interest in Christ or come to him, because according to his idea an interest in Christ was the privilege of all men indiscriminately, and that the reason why men were not happy in the enjoyment of it was, that they would not allow themselves to be persuaded that they were continually in a state of reconciliation:" And again, "That the only cause why a man should at any time be sorrowful, was regret or dissatisfaction at himself, for not believing himself to be in a state of favour with God:" And again, "That by the death of Christ, all mankind were put into a state of pardon, or in that state in which God was not imputing their sins to them, and that the continued belief of this fact was all that was necessary to constitute the faith of the gospel."

*Fourthly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in the sermon preached by you as aforesaid on the eighth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, in presence of the



Presbytery of Dumbarton, being the day on which the Presbytery held a parochial visitation of the parish of Row, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or of August immediately following, used the following expressions, or at least expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, "That it was an indispensable feature in the character of a Christian, that he should know that God has had mercy on him, and has forgiven him."

*Fifthly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell in the sermon preached by you as aforesaid, in the school-house at Helensburgh, on one of the days of the month of October eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, "That men allowing themselves to remain in doubt with respect to the simple fact of their having been individually restored to a state of favour with God, was the cause of all their misery, and that this was really the unbelief which the gospel condemns, it was giving the lie to God."

*Sixthly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper at Row, in the month of July eighteen hundred and thirty, in fencing the tables, debarred from the Lord's Supper, "all who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation."

*Seventhly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a sermon preached by you in the parish church of Row, on the fourth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or August immediately following, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, "All men are both under the curse and under grace at the same time:" And on the same occasion, you said that the doctrine of the Church of Scotland regarding election "tended to fatalism."

*Eighthly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, at a parochial examination at Easterton, in the parish of Row, in the autumn of eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, when explaining the nature of faith from the question in the Shorter Catechism, "What is faith in Jesus Christ," observed, "That none could receive and rest upon Christ for salvation, who had not an assurance of their own salvation;" or words to that effect.

*Ninthly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a sermon preached by you at Row on the fourth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or August immediately following, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, "That every man is in this state, that while he has in him death in Adam, he has life given him by Christ,"—"That the curse in Adam extended only to the death of the body, and takes effect upon all—the blessing of life in Christ is co-extensive with the curse, and belongs to all upon whom the curse has passed—that if Christ had not died, mankind would not have risen, nor would they have gone to hell to eternal punishment, but to Hades."

*Tenthly*, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in the sermon preached by you as aforesaid, in the Floating Chapel at Greenock, on the said twenty-eighth day of April eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of March immediately preceding, or May immediately following, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import or tendency, *videlicet*, "Now, inasmuch as it is true concerning you, that in the first place, the work of God in Christ has put away your sins, so that it is the fact, that your sins are at this moment not imputed to you—inasmuch as it is true, in the second place, that the character of God, the real name of God, what he truly is, is revealed in this very work of God in

Christ, so that no person can see that work and be ignorant of God;—and inasmuch as it is true, in the third place, that Christ has the Holy Ghost for you, that in the Spirit you may behold and enter into and dwell in the light of God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ; inasmuch as these things are true, you observe, that sinners as you are, that deserving of condemnation, and by nature under condemnation as you are, that notwithstanding all the evil of your circumstances as these have arisen from the fall; your new circumstances which have arisen from the work of God in Christ, are such that it is perfectly reasonable to say to you, 'fear God and give him glory.' You are actually in a condition to meet this demand; you are precisely in circumstances in which to receive this command; there is no one thing you can name that creates the least obstacle, why you should not at this moment 'fear God and give him glory:.' And again, "Now let me not be misunderstood, I am not saying that God has no right to judge his creatures, I am not saying that the judgment recorded 'in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' is not a righteous judgment. But this I say, that the principle upon which Christ judges the earth, is that Christ has redeemed us.—Not that the judgment suspends the pardon—not that the judgment makes the pardon conditional—not that it makes it uncertain till the judgment is come;—but that the judgment pre-supposes our forgiveness, that it has a reference to our forgiveness, that it is as those who have been forgiven that we judged shall be:." And again, "If we look at the actual condition of men, we would say, here is the darkness of total ignorance of the mercy that is in God—of the might that is in God for us.—Here are people who do not know that Christ died for them—who do not know that Christ has the Spirit for them—who do not know that the Bible says that their sins are remitted—here are people who conceive that they are giving God

glory in saying there is no proof of these facts. This is the real darkness in which men are living." All which or part thereof being found proved by the said Reverend Presbytery of Dumbarton, before which your Case is to be heard, it ought to be found and declared that you are unfit and unworthy to remain a minister of the Church of Scotland; and you ought to be forthwith deposed from the office of the holy ministry, and from the pastoral charge of the said church and parish of Row, and the said church ought to be declared vacant. According to the Laws of the Church of Scotland, and the usage observed in the like cases.

(Signed) { GEORGE M'LELLAN, Farmer, Bolernick.  
 PETER TURNER, Farmer, Bolernick.  
 A. LENNOX, Surgeon, Helensburgh.  
 ALEX. M'DOUGAL, Grocer, Row.  
 JOHN M'KINLAY, Greenfield, Row.  
 JOHN THOMSON, Spirit-dealer, Helensburgh.  
 PARLAN M'FARLANE, Farmer, Farlane.  
 ALEX. M'LEOD, Feuar, Helensburgh.

---

*List of Witnesses to be adduced for proving the foregoing Libel.*

Reverend Patrick Brewster, one of the Ministers of the Abbey Parish of Paisley.  
 Peter M'Leod, Clothier in Helensburgh.  
 Robert M'Farlane, Farmer in Greenfield, lying between the Parish Church of Row and Gare-Loch head.  
 John M'Farlane, Feuar in Helensburgh.  
 Peter Bain, Teacher at Gare-Loch head, near Helensburgh.

James Bain, Student of Divinity, residing in Easterton,  
near Helensburgh.

James Brown, Parochial Teacher in Row.

Reverend William Cunningham, residing in Greenock.

Frederick Hope Pattison, sometime residing in Glas-  
gow, now in Helensburgh.

Archibald Patterson, sometime manufacturer in Glas-  
gow, now residing in Helensburgh.

Reverend John Arthur, residing in Helensburgh.

Reverend Robert Crawford, assistant to the Reverend  
Mr Archibald Wilson, Minister of Cardross.

Reverend Doctor Robert Burns, one of the Ministers  
of Paisley.

Alexander Munro, now or lately Tutor in the family  
of Lord John Campbell, Ardincaple House, near  
Helensburgh.

William Stewart, Surgeon in Glasgow.

Robert Baillie Lusk, Bookseller in Greenock.

James Dunn, Anchorage Office in Greenock.

(Signed)	{	George McLellan, Farmer, Bolernick.
		Peter Turner, Farmer. Bolernick.
		A. Lennox, Surgeon, Helensburgh.
		Alex. McDougal, Grocer, Row.
		John McKinlay, Greenfield, Row.
		John Thomson, Spirit-dealer, Helensburgh.
		Parlan M'Farlane, Farmer, Farlane.
		Alex. M'Leod, Feuar, Helensburgh.

Which Libel the Presbytery having duly considered, did  
and hereby do, agreeably to the Form of Process, appoint  
the Clerk to make out a complete extract thereof, to be  
served upon said Mr John M'Leod Campbell:—and fur-  
ther appoint the Presbytery Officer to go to the Manse of  
Row and serve the same upon Mr Campbell, or leave it at

his dwelling-house, together with the List of Witnesses and a Copy of the Productions in aid of Proof, on or before Friday the tenth current, and summon him to appear before the Presbytery at their next Meeting, on Tuesday, the twenty-first current, at twelve o'clock noon. And the Officer is to return to the Presbytery on that day an Execution of the said Summons, signed by himself and two witnesses to the delivery thereof.

Extracted from the Records of the Presbytery of Dum-barton, on this and the preceding twenty-two pages, by

WILLIAM JAFFRAY, *Pby. Clk*

# ANSWERS

FOR THE

REV. J. M'L. CAMPBELL, MINISTER OF ROW.

TO

The LIBEL at the instance of George M'Lellan, Peter Turner, A. Lennox, Alexander M'Dougall, John Mac-Kinlay, John Thomson, Parlan M'Farlane, and Alexander M'Leod, designing themselves heads of families and inhabitants of the Parish of Row.

I now stand libelled by some of my parishioners before my Presbytery ; a situation which for some time I have in a measure anticipated, while I have felt it my duty as long as it might be to shun it. I have not courted, what may be called, legal investigation into the manner in which I have discharged the duty of a teacher in the church of Christ. However much I have felt the desirableness, in one view, of escaping the misconception to which it exposed me ; it is in the knowledge of the Presbytery, that so long as I did not find myself *obliged* to take the place of an accused person, and to submit to judicial inquiry into the doctrines which I hold and teach, I have avoided doing so. I have acted thus under the conviction that it was not the will of God that I should be made to turn aside from the straightforward path of duty, in testifying to truth, both in the public ministry of the Word and otherwise, by adopting any step which was commended simply by considerations of regard to my own character and estimation, in the judgment of those who would not discriminate between an impatience under the feeling of *appearing* to shrink from

the avowal of opinions held, and true faithfulness. There is always enough of light to afford those who will take the trouble to inquire, abundant opportunity of applying the rule of our Lord, "By their fruits ye shall know them." And the person who is content to go on testifying to the truth of God, and who refuses to be tempted of Satan, to lay aside the work of commending the love of Christ to men, for that of defending himself from their attacks, will feel in the dying away successively, of the successive misrepresentations to which he has been exposed, a commendation of the wisdom of having patiently borne with them, and proceeded with his Master's work.

I say this much with reference to the past, because know it has been thought that I ought to have courted investigation, when the charge of heresy had become associated with my name. I have felt that I had something else to do, than defend myself;—and, as to the *interests of the truth*, I have felt that it was not in the form of an exculpation of myself that I was to preach Christ crucified,—yet God may use what may be so regarded (but what I desire to see with a feeling in no respect personal) for his own glory in the Gospel; and therefore have I occupied a moment in explaining the principle of my past conduct, desiring thereby to remove any prejudice which any misapprehension of it might awaken in considering my present defence.

And now that the time is come for answering judicially to the question, What do I teach and preach? and now that a libel against me is presented to my Presbytery, and that they are called upon to put to me the question, Are these charges just? I assure my Brethren, that it is my earnest and single desire to put them in possession of the *facts* in this matter. I shall not put any party to the trouble of proving what I know to be true, while, on the other hand, I have confidence in God, that any thing which



I am not prepared to recognise as true, I shall be enabled to disprove.

I feel that I am placed under some disadvantage by the indefiniteness of the statements in the major proposition of the libel ; not that I cannot attach definite ideas to the words used, but that in the discussions on these subjects which I have heard and read, I know that they have been employed with a meaning different from that which I attach to them ; and to give to the doctrines there denounced an acknowledgment, without explanation, would be to run the risk of seeming to hold what I detest and abhor. I also feel that there is some cause of complaint in that while certain doctrines are stated to be contrary to the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church, there is no specification of the passages, either in the Scriptures, or in the Standards, which are held to contradict them.

I do not, however, found upon these things. But before proceeding to the direct reply to the charges against my teaching, now preferred, this may be the proper time for directing the attention of my brethren to the unconstitutional use which is made in the libel of an Act of Assembly. In the major proposition, the Act of 1720, on the subject of the Marrow of Modern Divinity, is referred to, as if it were part and parcel of the constitutional law of the church, and to be taken as fixing an interpretation of the standards. The Presbytery are aware, that by the Act of Assembly 1697, Session 6, entitled, " An act anent the method of passing acts of Assembly of *General Concern* to the Church, and for preventing of Innovations," commonly called the *Barrier Act*, it is provided, " That before any General Assembly of this Church shall pass any acts which are to be *binding rules and constitutions* to the church, the same acts be first proposed as overtures to the Assembly, and being by them passed as such, be remitted to the consideration of the several Presbyteries of this church, and their opinions and consent reported

by their Commissioners to the next General Assembly following, who may then pass the same in Acts, *if the more general opinion of the Church thus had agreed thereunto*\*. Acts of Assembly that have not this history, therefore, are *not Laws* of the Church, but simply decisions upon the law, and bear the same relation to the law, that a decision of a court of law bears to any act of the Legislature; and therefore such Acts of an Assembly no more control following Assemblies, or any other church court acting in a judicial capacity, than the decisions of one judge control another judge in his application of statute law. I do not mean to make light of an Act of the General Assembly of the Church. The responsibility of the Church in respect of her General Assemblies is great, and when they are rightly guided, the Church has great cause of thankfulness; and when it is otherwise, great cause of humiliation; and causes of humiliation the Acts of Assemblies may often be; but in these cases there is great reason to rejoice, that by the Barrier Act already quoted, the Church, while she ought to confess them as sin, is not bound by them, but is free even to testify against them, either in her courts, or by the lips and writings of individual members. The Act of Assembly 1720, founded on in the libel, did certainly appear to some of the most holy and honoured ministers of that time, an act of the description which called for such a testimony, and they have borne it. And not unfrequently since, have ministers of the church united their testimony to that of these men; esteeming it an honour to be associated with persons whom they regarded as shining lights, in a period of much darkness; and it is a cause of thankfulness that such testimonies exist. And if there were any doubt as to the liberty enjoyed by the members of the Church to disclaim the authority of that Act as a binding law, the toleration of such testimonies would be enough to establish it. But if indeed there is any case in

\* Act of Assembly, 1697, Session 6.

which the strict application of the Barrier Act is of peculiar importance, it is in a question of doctrine. It might be of little moment whether the temporary impression made upon a particular Assembly of her ministers, bound the Church as to a question of union of offices, or relating to the period of attendance of her students at Universities, though in such matters it is unquestionable that no Act of Assembly could change the order that now holds ; but it would be a matter of very awful importance, if it were possible that an interpretation of her standards, commended, it might be, by the eloquence or ingenuity of an individual member of Assembly, and carrying for the time the minds of the majority along with it, should fix their meaning for the time to come ; and become in fact itself the Church's authorized creed. It cannot be denied that an interpretation so adopted might possibly be a false one, and in that case, to give it authority would be to change the standard altogether. But no Assembly has power to fix an interpretation on the standards, any more than it has power to change them. Each Assembly acting in its judicial and executive capacity, will come to decisions, and carry them into effect, according to its own views of the Church's Laws ;—and those whose interests may be affected are bound to submit, but while submitting, as there is no appeal, they may still protest ; and any minority, not agreeing in the judgment of the Assembly, may dissent ; and such protest and such dissent, will go down to the future as a testimony demanding the sympathy of the Church : and such sympathy it may receive, and such sympathy may be expressed even in Acts of subsequent Assemblies, contradictory to the decision complained of. This shows clearly in what light the General Assemblies' interpretations of the Church's Law are to be regarded. If they were in any sense an authoritative fixing of the Law itself, no such protests or dissents could be received ; neither could dissent be avowed without exposing the person avowing it to extrusion from the Church.

My Brethren, therefore, will feel that they come unfettered by the judgment of the Assembly referred to, to the consideration of this subject; and whether they shall see cause to interpret the standards of the church, as that Assembly have done or not, at least that there is neither any obligation upon them to bow to it as authority, nor right to found upon it in their sentence, nor liberty to feel delivered by it from the responsibility of weighing the matter for themselves.

I trust, however, that the Presbytery shall be enabled to see the matter in another light; and if the present discussions be overruled to leading the church to improve the opportunity which they afford of wiping away the stain brought upon her annals by the Act 1720, I shall feel it cause of much thankfulness to God, however painful in themselves they now are.

The doctrines stated in the major proposition of the libel, as contrary to the Scriptures, and the standards of the church; are thus expressed, "Universal atonement, and pardon through the death of Christ, and that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation." *Understanding these expressions in the sense in which I might use them*, my answer to the libel is, that it is *altogether irrelevant*, inasmuch as the statement of the major proposition is *altogether untrue*, and I now desire, as briefly as may be, without the risk of obscurity, to state to my Brethren the doctrines of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, and that assurance is of the essence of faith, and essential to salvation, *as I hold and teach them*: showing their consistency with, and authority from, the Holy Scriptures, and then, that they are in nothing contrary to, but are altogether in harmony with, our church's standards.

#### I. These doctrines are the doctrines of Scripture.

It may give distinctness to consider universal atonement

and pardon through the death of Christ, here stated as one doctrine, as in truth they are, separately.

*First*, As to the extent of the atonement; I hold and teach that Christ died for all men—that the propitiation which he made for sin, was for all the sins of all mankind—that those for whom he gave himself an offering and a sacrifice unto God for a sweet smelling savour, were the children of men without exception and without distinction. And this the Scriptures teach.

It is written in Deut. xvii. 15, “Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.” Upon this principle God hath ordained a kingdom in the hand of a mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ. “Thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty; I have exalted one *chosen out of the people*.”\* The Lord Jesus is therefore set before us, first as our brother, and then as our king; and his work in our flesh—the atonement which he made for sin—the offering of himself a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour unto God—the giving himself a ransom for many, is first the manifestation of his meeting the law of God as our brother; and is then the foundation of his throne as our king; and what the scriptures teach concerning him in both respects, equally prove the extent of the atonement, as for all mankind.

As our brother—our fellow-servant—come, by his own voluntary deed, under the law of God, under which we were created, it was due from him that he should love his neighbour as himself, and every man was his neighbour; therefore that work by which he expressed his love, and proved it was a work for all. Certainly we know he was made under the law—certainly we know that he magnified

\* Psalm lxxxix. 19.

the law and made it honourable—certainly we know that by one work he both bore its curse, and fulfilled its requirements—certainly we know that that law is love, yea, love to all : and to limit the love of Christ to some from among those to whom he became related, as bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, would be to deny that the righteous law of God had any fulfilment in him. “Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God ; neither he that loveth not his brother, for this is the message (*margin commandment*) that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Not as Cain who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother.”\* “Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him—hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.”†

Again, as our king—he of whom it is written, “Unto me every knee shall bow,” the principle of his reigning is his manifested love to all. The footing upon which his exaltation to the throne is placed, is that “he loved righteousness,” even the righteous law of love. “Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness ; therefore O God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.”‡ The homage that is required to this King, is the homage of love ; the ground upon which it is demanded, is, that “He hath loved us and given himself for us :” and the condemnation to which men are exposed, and which bringeth along with it the wrath to come, is the refusing to have such a one to reign over us. Therefore it is clear that the work by which he hath manifested the love which hath been rewarded with the throne on which he sits, has been a work of love for all who are called upon to obey the sceptre of his kingdom.

\* 1 John iii. 10.

† Ver. 15.

‡ Psalm xlv. 7.

The ordination of a kingdom in the hand of a Mediator—the manifestation of the Lord Jesus, first in suffering humanity, the man of sorrows—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; and then as God's King upon Zion, reigning in righteousness—all has its explanation in the result that the Son is to deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all. Therefore when we see first character manifested apart from power in what Christ did in his state of humiliation; and then, power acting according to that character in his glory; God is teaching us truly to know himself; first to know what he is, that he is love, and then, to know that *he* who is love is God—that power belongs to Him alone to whom also belongs mercy. Thus it is the glory of God which we have unveiled to us in the face of the Lord Jesus Christ—hence can Jesus say of himself, “he that hath seen me hath seen the Father;” and while we are contemplating in the history of the Messiah, the history of a love suffering unto death for its enemies, and then taking the seat of power, and on the ground that it hath so loved, beseeching these its enemies to be reconciled to its sceptre, we are not only seeing the award of the righteous God to ~~him~~ who loved righteousness, but we are seeing God vindicating the character of his own government, and proving that He hath another claim on the hearts of his intelligent creatures than that they depend upon him—even that he loves them. To limit the atonement is to deny that this is the counsel of God which he hath accomplished in Jesus Christ; seeing that if Christ only loved some, and died for some, we have no longer the Creator revealed in the Redeemer; and we can no longer say to every man, that he is to look to the sufferings of Calvary if he would know the heart of Him in whom he lives, and moves and has his being—and we cannot say, that that which was prophesied of the forerunner of the Lord, that he should say unto the cities of Judah,

Behold your God, was fulfilled when John the Baptist said of Jesus of Nazareth, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

To be more particular.

In more pointedly and specifically vindicating this doctrine, of the universal extent of the atonement, from the charge of being inconsistent with the Scriptures, seeing that there is no specification, in the libel, of any portion of the Word of God as opposed to it ; I would *first* distinctly deny that it is any where stated in the Scriptures, that the work of Christ was *only* for some men. I am aware that certain passages are often quoted as amounting to such a statement ; these are John x. 10, 15, 27, 28, 29, and xv. 13—16, Titus ii. 14, Eph. v. 25. Yet it is manifest that these passages only contain the assertion of a part of a wider truth, by which that which they state is comprehended. It is utterly unwarrantable to say, that when Christ states that he lays down his life for the sheep, he denies that he has also laid down his life for the many who refuse to receive him as the good Shepherd, and to follow him as the sheep of his pasture ; Or that, whilst he recognises the election of the Father in the coming of those who come to him for life ; and regards them as given to him, and not as drawn out of the mass by any peculiar readiness in them to be attracted by the love which he was manifesting to all, that therefore he teaches, that there was no such love to all manifested. It is unnecessary to consider the passages singly, as the principle on which they are all misapplied is the same, viz. understanding the statement of the love manifested to some, as amounting to a denial of the love manifested to the rest.

If indeed there had been no statements but those in question on the subject of the work of Christ, with reference to those for whom it was undertaken, it might have been assumed as likely that it had no more extended reference than that which was expressed ; although, even in that case,



simple silence would not be enough to prove that there was nothing true beyond what was stated; but it must be held utterly unwarrantable to use such an argument to the contradiction of *distinct* and *pointed* statements of the Word of God. The Scriptures say that "God so loved the *world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life."\* Nothing but a distinct statement that the *world* does not mean the *world* can limit this declaration as to the object of the work of Christ.

The Scriptures say, He is the propitiation "for the sins of the *whole world*:"† nothing but a distinct and pointed contradiction could warrant us in hesitating to receive these words in their plain and obvious meaning; and even such a contradiction could only have the effect of leaving us in the dark as to what the truth of God was; for *no words* could more plainly say that Christ did *not* die for all, than these say that *He did*.

The Scriptures say that "All we like sheep had gone astray, and that the Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all."‡ And we cannot hesitate to believe the *all* who have gone astray are the same *all* whose iniquities were laid on Jesus.

The Scriptures say that "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life:"§ and it is manifest, that no words could be more fitted to mislead us than these are, if the *all* upon whom the judgment hath come to condemnation, be not the same *all* upon whom the free gift hath come to justification of life.

The ordination of the kingdom in the hand of a Mediator is announced in the second Psalm, "Yet have I set my King

\* John iii. 16.

† Isaiah liii. 6.

‡ 1 John ii. 2.

§ Rom. v. 18.

upon my Holy Hill of Zion. I will declare the decree, the Lord, hath said to me, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee ;”\* and in Acts xiii. 32, we have this ordination of God announced as the Gospel, “And we declare unto you *glad tidings*, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again ; as is also written in the second Psalm, ‘Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.’ As concerning that He raised him from the dead, no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David,”† (referring to that passage, Isaiah lv. which proceeds thus, “Behold I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people.”) Such intimations could not be given as good news to every man, were not love to every man, as we have already stated, the foundation of Christ’s throne. Accordingly every form in which the Gospel is addressed to sinners manifests that its substance is good will and love to them.

“The angel said unto them, Fear not, for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people, For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is Christ the Lord.”‡ Thus to these shepherds, spoken to just as of the family of man, the birth of Christ *the Lord* is announced as the *glad tidings of the birth of a Saviour to them*.

“Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, for the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world.”§ Thus does Christ announce himself as the bread of life given *unto them* in speaking to a mixed multitude, yea, in speaking to a multitude whom

\* Psalm ii. 6.

† Luke ii. 10.

‡ Acts xiii. 32.

§ John vi. 32, 33.

he immediately afterwards reproves for their rejection of him. "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen me and believe not."\* Yet to them did he announce it as glad tidings, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give him is my *flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world."†—So that in saying my Father giveth you the true bread—he saith, as elsewhere to some from among the many of whom it was true—"this is my body, which was given for you: this cup is the New Testament in my blood shed for you."‡

"Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water."§ Thus are we taught, that did this woman know the gift of God, she would have known that she had a share in it, and that the life which was in Christ was in him for her; and when she knew the gift of God, and was made instrumental in bringing her countrymen to Jesus, thus did they express their knowledge, saying to the woman, "Now we believe not because of thy saying, but we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."||

"If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son."¶ Here we learn, that the condition of him who believes the gospel is that he says, "God hath given to us eternal life;" and that in saying *us*, he means the *chil-*

\* John vi. 36.

† John vi. 51.

‡ Luke xxii. 19, 20.

§ John iv. 10.

|| John iv. 42.

¶ 1 John v. 9—11.

*dren of men*, is manifest in this, that every child of Adam who cannot respond to the word—who does not join him and say also—God hath given us eternal life, is chargeable with denying the testimony which God hath given concerning his Son. And this is the picture of God and men here set before us.—God saying to men, I have given you eternal life, and some men believing God and answering, Thou hast given us eternal life, and some men saying, We have no proof that God hath given us eternal life, and thus making God a liar.—And is it not most obvious that if all believed God, all would be saying, God hath given us eternal life, and therefore that in very truth, God *hath* given, and hath declared himself to have given eternal life to all.

“Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the *gospel* which I *preached* unto you. For I delivered unto you *first of all*, that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again according to the Scriptures.”\* Here we are taught what it was that the apostle had FIRST announced to the Corinthians; when finding them in the condition of heathenism, he preached to them the gospel; and then he had told them, speaking of them and himself together, as alike interested in the work of Christ, although at that time *they* knew not that interest, and *he* did, “Christ died for our sins.” It is impossible to escape the conviction that their knowledge that Christ died for their sins, of which he supposes the Corinthians in possession, he also states them to have received from himself at his first coming amongst them, as the *good news* which he brought them, and that in now speaking to them when they were believers, and saying Christ died for our sins, he is just using the very expression, and making the very same announcement, which he had made when speaking to them,

\* 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3.

yet unbelievers—and that the fact that Christ died for them was not inferred from the fact that they were believers, but was itself the fact which at his first appearance among them, he had asked them to believe.

While the gospel announces a cause of joyfulness to all, in the work of God in Christ, and the appointment of him as the Mediator, it ever addresses to men a demand on them that they meet the counsel of God in Christ, by repenting towards God and being reconciled to God. Now by the footing on which this call is placed, and the inducement to compliance with it held out, the scriptures distinctly teach the universality of the atonement.

“Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ: Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do. Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you and unto your children, and to all that are afar off; as many as the Lord our God shall call.”\* Thus is the Gospel promise declared to be unto men who are addressed as still in unbelief; and this promise made the ground upon which they are called to repent.

“Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech by us, we pray in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God; ~~for~~ he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”† “We then as workers together with him, beseech also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.”‡ Here the apostle, in writing to the Corinthians, introduces the general statement of the word of reconcilia-

\* Acts ii. 36—39.

† 2 Cor. v. 20, 21.

‡ Ver. 1.

tion which he was commissioned to preach. He called upon men, saying, Be ye reconciled to God. He made the foundation of this call an act of love on the part of God towards them, as it was towards himself, saying, "~~for~~ he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, ~~that~~ we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" and, in the realization of this love, as having already come forth upon them, he beseeches them that they "receive not the grace of God in vain," that is to say, himself once a rebel, he comes to the other rebels with whom he had been joined in league against their sovereign; and now reconciled and brought back to his allegiance, by knowing his own part in a love manifested to him and them, he announces to them their part in it, and calls upon them, like him, to be reconciled. It is manifest, that the whole power of the exhortation is lost if any of them could turn and ask what proof there was that *they* were the objects of the deed of love upon which he founded it, and that he was not in the condition to tell them with certainty that they were.

As the gospel is accompanied with the call to be reconciled to God, so is it with the admonition to share in the feelings of God towards our fellow-men, and to the expression of these feelings in asking from God, for them, that good which he hath taught us is according to his good will towards them. By the manner in which this instruction is conveyed to us, the Scriptures also teach the universal extent of the atonement.

As to sharing in the feeling of God to others, we are thus taught, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."\* Setting before us the family of men, ourselves and others—as under the love manifested by the gift of Christ, as the propitiation for our sins, and expected to

\* 1 John iv. 10.

love each other, with the love wherewith God has thus loved us all. To the same effect is also a passage already quoted, "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."\*

As to praying for others, we are thus taught, "I exhort therefore that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for *all men*; for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth; for there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time."† Here it is manifest that we are exhorted to pray for *all*, because that is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour—that it is proved to be good and acceptable in the sight of God, because God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth; and the existence of this will on the part of God, is proved by the truth, that as there is one God, so there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, and that this Mediator, in whom we see God, and in knowing whom we know God, gave himself a ransom for all. So that the call to pray for all rests on the willingness of God to save all, as manifested by the death of Christ for all.

While the Scriptures call us to repentance towards God, and would teach us to have the mind of God in us towards others, by considerations which imply the universality of the atonement; they teach the same doctrine by the view they give of the future history of men, and of the character and results of that judgment which awaits them. It is appointed to all men once to die, and after death the judg-

\* 1 John iii. 16.

† 1 Tim. ii. 1—6.

ment : This judgment supposes resurrection from the dead—it supposes some common rule or principle of judgment ; and one judge having equal right and authority over all.

If we consider the first of these things—that the men who are to be judged are to be raised for judgment, and inquire what the Scriptures teach on the subject of resurrection, we are taught what distinctly implies the universality of the atonement, and (as it is written) that “Christ tasted death for every man.”\*—“For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead ; for as in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive : but every man in his own order, Christ the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ’s at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father ; when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power ; for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy which shall be destroyed is death.”† Here we learn that the resurrection of the dead has come by Christ, and that all the dead shall be made alive in Christ. Accordingly we find, in the book of Revelation, the destruction of the last enemy, death, thus recorded,—“And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire ; this is the second death ;”‡ so that after the final judgment there is no record of the death which came through the first Adam, and which the second Adam tasted for every man, so bringing in the resurrection of the dead.

Again, as to the principle or rule of that judgment which awaiteth all men, and for which they are to be raised, that which the Scriptures teach on this subject, equally implies the universality of the atonement. Paul thus describes the judgment of God—“For there is no respect of persons with God ; for as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law ; and as many as have sinned in

\* Heb. ii. 9.

† 1 Cor. xv. 21—26.

‡ Rev. xx. 14.



the law, shall be judged by the law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel."\* One talent—his forgiving love, flowing through the atonement of Christ as a goodness leading men to repentance, is that for which God holds all men responsible, and according as it hath or has not led them to repentance, shall they be judged. Under the darkest heathenism with which man hath ever enveloped himself, the charge of God against his ungodliness is, "Despisest thou the riches of my goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance, but, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God."† And in these last times, and this dispensation of the Spirit, the "scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, where is the promise of his coming,"‡ are herein condemned of the Lord, in that they understand not that the "Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some men count slackness, but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; neither account that the long-suffering of our God is *salvation*."§ This one grace—one goodness, giving opportunity to return to God, revealed with different measures of light, in that God hath never left himself without a witness, is the fruit of the atonement made once for all, and therefore, saith the Apostle, "God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel." No doubt that is a far higher light, for which *he* is responsible, to whom it is preached that Christ is risen, and hath received the promise of the Father, and is soon coming for judgment, than that for which *he* is responsible, who, in his condition of rebellion, has God's forgiving love announced to him, and

\* Rom. ii. 11, 12, 16.

† 2 Pet. iii. 4.

‡ Rom. ii. 4, 5.

§ 2 Pet. iii. 9.

God's call to repentance addressed to him by the rain from heaven, and the fruitful seasons; but of the least manifestation of that goodness which affords space for return to God, the atonement is the great channel, and the only explanation, consistent with the glory of the holiness and righteousness of God.

And as to His right to judge, who is revealed as the judge, the universality of the atonement is taught by the statements of Scripture on this subject also; inasmuch as the bond which connects Christ with all mankind, is given as the reason why he is appointed judge of all. "For the Father judges no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. He hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man."\* In the 19th chapter of Luke, our Lord thus speaks of his going to receive a kingdom, "A certain nobleman went unto a far country to receive a kingdom to himself and to return." In Revelation 5th chap. we see him, as in the far country, receiving the kingdom, thus described, "And I looked, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne." We have thus his receiving the book of the inheritance, connected with his character as the Lamb that had been slain. And when he returns and calls for his enemies that they may be slain before him, we have his right over them declared, and the refusal to acknowledge his right, represented as the just ground of their judgment. We cannot thus see Christ reigning and judging as the Son of man, receiving the inheritance as the Lamb that had been slain, and at the same time punishing sin as rebellion against his rightful authority,

\* John v. 22, 27.

without understanding that we are taught by these things, that "he gave himself a ransom for all," and that, according as it is written, those who deny his Lordship over them,

*"Deny the Lord that bought them."\**

But the counsel of God revealed to us in his word, contains a farther discovery besides that of his present *grace* to men, and the judgment that awaits them; in that it carries us back from the contemplation of the distinction that holds among men, between those who receiving the grace of God in vain, are heirs of damnation, and have awaiting them the wrath to come; and those who, receiving the grace of God into believing hearts, are heirs of glory, and partakers in the kingdom that is to be revealed, to an electing purpose in God, which hath been accomplished in that work of the Father, whereby they have been made willing to receive the Son to reign in their hearts. Now, what the scriptures state on the subject of Election, distinctly teaches also the universal extent of the atonement. Thus it is written, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ."† By which words we are made to know that the thing to which the Elect are chosen, in respect of Christ, and by which they are marked and distinguished from the non-elect, is the obedience and *sprinkling* of His blood (which is the same with *the purging the conscience* from dead works, Heb. ix. 14), and *not* the having that blood *shed for them*. In like manner it is written, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son."‡ *Not* to the having the blood of his Son shed for the remission of their sins, which is no where said to be distinctive of them; and which, had it been distinctive, we would have expected to find enu-

\* 2 Pet. ii. 1.

† 1 Pet. i. 2.

‡ Rom. viii. 29.

merated among the links of the chain, by which God's foreknowledge of them is connected with their ultimate glory. The Elect are also thus addressed, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, *that ye should shew forth the praises of Him WHO HATH CALLED YOU OUT OF DARKNESS INTO HIS MARVELLOUS LIGHT.*"\* The light into which they were called was the light of the sun of righteousness; the praises (margin, *virtues*) of God which they were to show forth, were his glory in the face of Jesus Christ: that light of the sun of righteousness—that glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, was altogether independent of their being brought to know it—it was the manifested grace to all men—*IN their being brought to KNOW it, was their election shewn.*

On these grounds, therefore, do I hold the doctrine of universal atonement to be the doctrine of scripture, *viz.* That there is not one word pointedly or distinctly limiting the atonement—that there are many expressions distinctly averring that the work of Christ has been *for all men*—that the appointing him King of Zion, and ordaining a mediatorial kingdom in his hand, are announced as good news to *all men*—that the various forms in which this gospel of the kingdom is preached, contain internal evidence that Christ died for all—that the footing on which the call to repentance is addressed to sinners, is the manifested love of God in Christ to them—that the ground upon which the obligation to love our brethren is put, is the love of God in Christ, and the call to prayer for them is founded on Christ's having given himself a ransom for all—that the judgment to come both in respect of a resurrection of men for judgment, of the principle of the judgment, and of his title to judge, before whose judgment-seat *all* must stand—teach the same doctrine—and finally, that it is implied in the statements of the scripture on the subject of election.

*Second.* The doctrine of universal pardon through the death of Christ.

And now I come to that part of the subject, on which I am most liable to misapprehension, and on which there has been most misrepresentation. On a subject of such vast importance, it were an awful evil to divert men's attention from the contemplation of substantial truth to mere verbal controversy; and with the knowledge that there are some among those who hesitate to adopt this form of expression, who do substantially hold that which is intended to be conveyed by it, I have found it a great relief from the fear that the opposition awakened had been produced by a word, to see that all the books published on the subject proceed on the admission, that the whole question resolves itself into the question of the extent of the atonement.

The pardon of sin may be understood to mean either an act of indemnity to the sinner, giving him security from all consequences of having sinned against God, irrespective of any condition as to moral character; or as the act of God in receiving back to the bosom of his love the returning sinner; or thirdly, as the removing the judicial barrier which guilt interposes between the sinner and God; so making the fact of being a sinner no hinderance to his coming to God, now, as to a reconciled Father.

In the first of these senses, the word has been generally used in the books that have been written to disprove the doctrine of universal pardon; and so understanding the term, it has not been difficult to make out that universal pardon is identical with universal salvation; and also that it confounds all moral distinctions as existing in the mind of God, and makes the sceptre of his kingdom no longer a sceptre of righteousness. But such a pardon is altogether a fiction of the mind's own—it is no where recognised in the scriptures as having any existence. Not only is it not the portion of all, but in fact it is not the portion of any:

to neither unbeliever nor believer is any immunity from future wrath secured, *apart* from his being prepared for being found of God in peace, at that day, in which he shall judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ. To hold otherwise is distinct antinomianism, and makes the atonement something to take those for whom it has been made out of the judgment of God; and not, as it really is, something to prepare them for that judgment, by bringing them into the condition in which they can say, "We may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as he is, so are we in this world." I need scarcely add, therefore, that *in such a sense as this, I do not hold the doctrine of universal pardon*; and that if this be the sense attached to the words in the major proposition of the libel, I may admit such a doctrine to be a relevant foundation for a charge, inferring penalties, but deny that it can in any way affect me.

Again, understanding pardon, as the act of God in receiving back to the bosom of his love the returning sinner—so understood, it is from the very nature of the thing, limited to the sinners who do return—the prodigal, still remaining in the far country, cannot possibly be received into the father's house. In this sense, pardon is very generally employed in the Scriptures, and is expressive, not of *one* act of God in reference to the sinner on his first believing in the love of God, but of the *continual* acting of God towards the sinner, living in a condition of intercourse and communion with God, and so is it the object of prayer to the believer continually, and to the last hour of his life in the flesh, whatever may have been his attainments in holiness, or conformity to the mind of God. It is in this sense that in the Psalms, which have been given us as the language of the spirit of adoption in the children of God, while still dwelling in a body of sin and death, the word is constantly used; and indeed the prayer for it implies more than

simply, that God would *receive* us to near communion with himself, being better explained by the words that he would *take* us unto communion with himself; the thing entreated for being, an outputting of his divine power in separating between us and our sin, as a real thing; and in raising us out of ourselves, to dwell in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, our living head.—Thus the Psalmist prays, “Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness; according to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions.” And, “Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquities, and cleanse me from my sins.”—Again, “Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.”—And “Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me; cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me, restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with thy free spirit.” Here it is manifest, that it is not remission of sin, as the removal of a judicial sentence, nor adoption into the family of God, as the prayer of one not yet knowing himself to be the object of the love of God, that is entreated—but that these are the prayers of one knowing God as his God, and having confidence in the present good will of God towards him, to give him good gifts, and so imboldened to ask of the Holy One that he would make him partaker in his holiness, and dwell in him by his Spirit—thus might such be—thus were such—the prayers of the Lord Jesus in the days of his flesh, while, notwithstanding of his having humbled himself to dwell in our nature, and to be made in the likeness of sinful flesh, he not the less continued to be the well-beloved of the Father, as he was the Holy One of God. Of course, in this second sense, I do not hold pardon to be universal, inasmuch as I do not hold that all have repented and returned to the Lord; and in so saying, I meet the many quotations which have been brought from the Scriptures to prove

that pardon is limited to those who believe, and to those who repent. If, therefore, this be the meaning of pardon as spoken of in the libel, I admit that to hold such a pardon was universal, would be a relevant ground of charge, as being contrary to the word of God; but I deny that this admission, any more than the former, in any way affects me.

The third sense of the expression pardon, enumerated above, *viz.* That it is an act of God, referring to a sinner, by which he declares his having sinned, to be no longer any barrier to his returning to the enjoyment of the light of God's love and favour; making that consciousness of guilt to be no longer a just cause of fear in seeking the face of God; yea, giving the assurance that it is not only a righteous thing in God to receive back into favour, not taking into account the sin justly chargeable against him; but even, so to speak, to help him back, and by his own Spirit to lift him up into the light of his own love, and enjoyment of his own holiness. *In this sense* I do hold—and in this sense I teach, the doctrine of universal pardon, through the death of Christ. For such a pardon I believe the Scriptures to reveal as extended to all—as the result of the atoning sacrifice of Christ for all—as the fruit of his propitiation for the sins of the world—as the condition in which God's accepting the sacrifice of Christ for mankind, has placed the children of men: and if it be this doctrine that the Libel designates as “universal pardon through the death of Christ,” I deny the relevancy of the libel in respect of it, with reference to the Scriptures, holding it to be altogether beyond controversy that this is the doctrine of the word of God.

The character of God as the fountain of life is so strange and ~~un~~understood a matter to the natural heart, which has never so known him, but has ever had acquaintance only with the broken cisterns which hold no water, that a par-



don, thus explained, seems to be a much less valuable boon than our enunciation of it as the pearl of great price—that, in the knowledge of which, the soul feels itself possessed of all it can desire, would intimate: and it is difficult to get people, even intellectually, to conceive that this is any thing else than the Arminian doctrine of God's readiness to forgive and pardon all, on condition of their repenting and believing. In truth, however, no two doctrines can be more widely different. Arminianism is the sanctifying with the name of religion pure self-righteousness. After a man is supposed to have repented and believed, on that system, he is only then in that condition of *right to come to God* with confidence, in which, according to the true doctrine of the Scriptures, he was placed by the sacrifice of Christ, as a propitiation for his sins; and as long as repenting and believing occupy in men's minds this place of *preliminary requisites*, in order to having *title* to approach God with boldness, of confidence in his fatherly love to us, and free acceptance of us, it makes little difference whether we *professedly* hold the system known by the name of *Arminianism*, or attempt to separate between ourselves and it by limiting the atonement, and by holding strictly that the faith and the repentance are the gifts of God.

As I am simply desirous to be distinctly understood, and wish for no indulgence which may arise from misapprehension, I am anxious that the free and unconditional character of the pardon which I believe and preach, may be apprehended, and this may be the better secured by my stating, in what respect I conceive the believer and the unbeliever to be the same, and in what respect in different situations in regard to this pardon.

They are, in the *same* situation, in that the *right* and *title* which they have to approach God with confidence, and put trust in him for things according to his will, is the same—even the place which he has given them, in giving

them Christ to be their living head—setting him forth as a “Witness, a Leader, a Commander to the people,” “exalted a Prince and a Saviour to grant repentance and remission of sins;” having led their captivity captive, and received gifts for the rebellious, that God the Lord might dwell among them.” *Having repented*—one particular in which they differ—has *not conferred* the right, for it has been but *taking advantage* of the right—my title to return to God, is not in the fact that I do return, but my returning is my availing myself of a title to return *antecedently conferred by God*, in the exercise of his free love. Again, *believing*—the other particular in which they differ—has not conferred the right in question, seeing that believing is nothing more or less than receiving *as true* God’s testimony on the subject of that right; and holding it as a fact, *because God hath said it*, “that God hath given to us eternal life, and that this life is in his Son.” My believing creates *nothing*—by believing I only receive what God has already given, light into my understanding and love into my heart—God himself to dwell in me by his Spirit who is the Spirit of Christ, and who is truth.

Believers and unbelievers are on the other hand in different situations, in respect of the pardon, in that believers are drinking of the fountain of life, of which pardon is the opening, while unbelievers are receiving no life whatever from it, but are as if it had been yet sealed.—This is a *present* difference; but inasmuch as God hath appointed a day in which he shall judge the world in righteousness, and inasmuch as the pardon extended to men has been intended to prepare men for being found of God in peace on that day, by reconciling them to God, and so making them righteous, there is *this* awful and solemn difference between believers and unbelievers, as to pardon, in respect of their prospects for the future, that, while to the former, the forgiveness that hath been extended to them, has been the

means of leading them back to God, and so saving them from the wrath to come, and giving them an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in Christ—to the latter, the same pardon is the ground of condemnation, and is that precious talent committed to them of the Lord, for their folding up of which in a napkin, and failing to cultivate it for the fruits of righteousness, they shall, if they abide in unbelief, have their place assigned them in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.

Distinctions, which successively arising heresies make it important to mark, are rather implied than expressed in the record of truth, of which all heresy is the perversion—it is, therefore, by the study of such subjects as the character of God as a fountain of life—the nature of repentance, as an actual *transition* from the condition of not giving God glory, to the condition of glorifying and enjoying him—of the nature of a salvation by faith, as a salvation by the knowledge of God—of the nature of righteousness, as an intelligent sympathy and oneness with the moral mind of God, and delight in his will—of the nature of obedience, whether of feeling, thought, word, or action, as the free working of a mind whose will is the same with the will of God, and which obeys with the same feeling with which God commands, truly testifying by its obedience that its judgment is, “good is the will of the Lord”—of the nature of the propitiation for sin, as a manifestation of God’s character in respect of sin, not for the purpose of making it possible for sinners to be taken out of his righteous judgment, but for the purpose of preparing them for judgment, by causing them to share in his estimate of sin, and so preparing them for being delivered from wrath in his righteousness—it is by the study of such subjects as these, that we shall come to feel that not one, or many passages, only, of the word of God, contain the doctrine on the subject of

pardon now held, *but that it is embodied in the whole of God's revelation of himself to man*—yea, is implied in all his present dealing with the children of men, whether in what is called the department of providence, or the department of grace; and is the explanation of his present forbearance, and the form of that goodness which is leading to repentance; as it will be the foundation of his future judgment, and the justification of his righteousness, in the outpouring of the wrath that is to come.

But to consider the subject with more special reference to particular statements of the Word of God, I quote these following:—

It is prophesied with reference to the first coming of the Messiah, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy."\*

If this be the annunciation of any less work, with reference to our sin, than that which I have been stating as universal pardon, I do not know what distinct conception can be attached to the expressions—"finishing transgression, making an end of sins, and making reconciliation for iniquity." As an actual thing, sin hath *not* been put away; therefore, unless put away as a thing *imputed*, it hath been put away in no sense at all.

The Spirit also, speaking in prophecy, says, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."† This is connected with the work of Christ, on his first coming, by the words which follow: "The voice of him that crieth

\* Daniel ix. 24.

† Is. xl. 1, 2.

in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord.”\* And again—“ Oh thou that bringest good tidings to Zion,† get thee up into the high mountain : Oh thou that bringest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength ; lift it up, be not afraid, say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God.”‡ Which prophecy was fulfilled, when John the Baptist seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, “ Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” Thus are the words—“ Cry unto her that her iniquity is pardoned,” and the words “ behold your God,” combined in the fulfilment—behold the “ Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.”

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is peculiarly occupied with the priestly office of Christ, it is written—“ Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had, by himself, *purged our sins*, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.”§—and again, “ For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us—nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year, with blood of others, for then must he *often* have suffered since the foundation of the world—but now *once*, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to *put away* sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment—so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.”|| —These expressions, “ *purged our sins* ”—“ *put away sin* ”—distinctly teach the doctrine which I am now advocating ; and when the Apostle passes from the contemplation of the

\* Isa. xl. 3.

† Marginal reading.

‡ Ver. 9.

§ Heb. i. 3.

|| Heb. ix. 24.

fact that it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment, to Christ's having offered himself to bear the sins of many, limiting the goodness of the news contained in his second coming to those "*who look for him*"—he is obviously proceeding upon the same principle of *present pardon* to all through the death of Christ, and future judgment with reference to that pardon, which has been held above.

But I most specially crave attention to the argument held upon the subject of sacrifices *for sin*, and remission *of sin*, in the 10th chapter of the same epistle to the Hebrews.—The apostle there argues, that the sacrifices offered year by year continually, could not make perfect as pertaining to the conscience ; that it could not relieve from the sense of judicial condemnation ; that this they could not do, because it was impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin : and therefore that in token of their inability to accomplish this, and of their being but the shadow of a good thing which was to come, they were repeated from year to year ; but that what the shadow could not accomplish the substance did ; that sin *was put away* by the one offering of Christ ; and that, because there was remission of sins, therefore there was no more sacrifice, " Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."\* And that by remission of sin, as a thing which he had proved, and by the consideration of which he exhorts them to draw near to God—he means just that *access to God through Christ* which has been described above ; as the pardon that embraces, and is upon all, is manifest from the conclusion of his reasoning, " Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus—by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say his flesh ; and having an high priest over the house of God, LET US DRAW NEAR with a true heart and in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from

\* Heb. x. 18.

an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."\*

The following passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians teaches the same view of the salvation that is through Christ. "For he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body, by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh: for through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father."† The *peace* here represented as being made by Christ through his cross, is explained as our *having access* through him by one Spirit unto the Father—to preach this peace to men, therefore, is to declare to them that they have access through Christ, by the Holy Ghost, unto God the Father—this is the same with announcing to them that they have access into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way; and, in *both* forms of expression, that is declared which I have stated as the pardon which I preach, viz. that it is an act of God, referring to a sinner, by which he declares his having sinned to be no longer any barrier to his returning to the enjoyment of the light of God's love and favour; making the consciousness of guilt no longer a just cause of fear in seeking the face of God—yea, giving the assurance that it is not only a righteous thing in God to receive back into favour, not taking into account the sin justly chargeable against him, but even, so to speak, to help him back, and by his own spirit to lift him up into the light of his own love, and enjoyment of his own holiness.

With this accord the account given of the ministry of reconciliation by the apostle, writing to the Corinthian Church,

\* Heb. x. 19.

† Eph. ii. 14.

“that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.”\* And in this have we the true conception given us of the character of our present condition, as not under the law, but under grace—that God accounts of Christ as the head and representative of the children of men, that he has given him power over all flesh, and fitted him as a fountain of life to all flesh—that to the end that they may have space for receiving this life, their sin not imputed to them, nor their personal guilt accounted of, while the day of grace lasts ; at the same time that it is the purpose of God to bring them to account for their share in this grace, which he hath caused to pass upon them ; condemning them, or acknowledging them, according as they have, or have not received the grace of God in vain.

I might proceed to quote passages in which the gospel is announced as glad tidings, and the effect of believing it set forth as being immediate peace and joy ; to show, from the consideration of the circumstances in which that message finds men, that it could not have furnished a reasonable ground for such feelings, did it not reveal to them the remission of their sins ; and, to the same effect, I might also quote the passages in which believers are addressed as knowing that they have the forgiveness of their sins in Christ, which knowledge they could only have had because the apostles in first coming amongst them had preached to them, through Christ, the forgiveness of sins—But if once the principle, on which such passages are evidence in this matter, be recognised, viz. that faith being the belief of the testimony of God, can contain no cause of rejoicing beyond the limit of the testimony itself, it will be felt unnecessary to quote particular passages, seeing that, upon this ground, almost every word addressed to the primitive churches might be founded on.

This then is my answer on the subject of universal pardon,



with reference to the relevancy of the libel ; pardon, in the sense in which its universality has been held to lead to licentiousness, viz. *immunity* from the consequences of sin without reference to moral character, I neither hold as to some, or as to all ; believing that there is no such thing under the government of a righteous God—pardon, as God's act in the Spirit, through Christ, of taking us up into fellowship and communion with himself, and raising us up out of the deep pit and miry clay of our sinful flesh, I hold *as limited to the elect of God*, who, through the faith of God's promises, are partakers of the divine nature, escaping the corruption that is in the world through lust—and the pardon, which is thus limited to them, is ever flowing to them, as the answer of their earnest cry and prayer—God's holy relief vouchsafed to the poor and needy, who are confessing their sins, and hungering and thirsting after righteousness—pardon, *as the removal of the barrier* in the way of our coming to God, which arises from personal guilt, and as the provision of actual strength, in the Spirit, to come to God, I hold to be the gift of God *to all*—in as much as it is contained in the gift of Christ ; and is the justification of the statement that God has given to all eternal life in him. If, in the libel, either of the first senses of the expression pardon be intended, I hold not the doctrine stated, and would admit the relevancy of the major proposition—but deny the truth of the minor as connecting me with such a charge.—If the third sense of the word, now explained, be that in which it is used, then I *deny* the relevancy of the charge, seeing that *in that sense universal pardon through the death of Christ is the revealed truth of God*.

3. The doctrine that assurance is of the Essence of Faith, and necessary to salvation, is also declared in the libel, to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures.

On this subject much misconception has arisen, from the loose and inaccurate use of terms—Faith being the belief of

God's testimony, assurance of faith should properly mean the confidence in its reality, with which *the thing testified is* contemplated ; and this is the Scripture use of the word—at the same time, it is likely, and may be assumed, that the expression is used, in the libel, in the sense in which it is usually employed in theological writings.—In these, it is rather the feeling of *personal interest* in the thing believed, than of the reality of the thing itself, that is intended to be expressed. At the same time, seeing that the words of God are spoken to us *personally*, and intended to be received *as life to ourselves individually*, there is not much reason to complain of this liberty taken with the expression, “ Assurance of Faith.” So long as men holding a limited atonement, held also that assurance was of the essence of faith, and so required that the love of God in Christ should be felt as *personal love*, in the mind's apprehension of it, though not held to be personal in the record—and so long as faith was thus made to embrace more than the word reveals, there was a risk of very serious error, and a door opened for a very insidious form of self-righteousness, under the name of what was called the appropriating act of faith—but when it is understood that faith needs not to change any thing, but may, taking things as they are, say, *my Lord* and *my God*—so long as it is understood, that the spirit of adoption is the spirit of faith in a *revealed* fatherly love, *then* there is no evil in associating the word faith with those feelings of personal delight in the Lord, and confidence towards God, which are *inseparable* from it. And on this subject I hold and teach, that *in believing* the gospel, there is *necessarily* present in the mind, the *certainty* that the person believing is the object of God's love manifested to him in the gift of Christ—the certainty that he has remission of his sins, the gift of the Spirit, and all things pertaining to life and to godliness, bestowed on him, by the free grace of God ; so that he feels himself debtor to God for the gift of eternal life ;

and this I hold to be so of the essence of faith, that is to say, so necessarily implied in the existence of true faith, that no person can be regarded as in the belief of God's testimony who is not conscious to it.

It is manifest, that no one can consistently hold, that God has given to every man, in Jesus Christ, all things pertaining to life and godliness, and at the same time not hold the doctrine of the assurance of faith as now stated. *In this sense*, therefore, I admit that if it be a relevant charge to infer penalties, to hold the doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, *then* does there lie a just charge against me—but I do not admit, on the contrary, I distinctly deny, that the doctrine of assurance of faith, *now stated*, is inconsistent with the truth of God.

I feel more difficulty in arguing this point from the Scriptures than either of the others, because the Scriptures *everywhere assume* that to believe God's expressed love, and to be assured of it, are the same thing; indeed it would appear a very strange addition to any authoritative declaration of God, to say, that it was not only to be believed, but that we must be certain it is true. I say this, because I have heard it asked how it should be the case that the Scriptures say so little on the subject of assurance, if it be a matter of so much importance. As I understand the record, there is a demand for assurance every time it is said, Thus saith the Lord—but it has naturally arisen from the limitation of the atonement, that, those holding that doctrine, should appear to themselves entitled to distinguish between the certainty of the truth of what God says, and the assurance of his love to themselves personally.—On their views they were so entitled. Those, likewise, who admitting the extent of the atonement, saw not its results, as placing all men under grace, and including them in the same forgiveness, were, upon another ground, led to make the same se-

paration; seeing that on their system, no one is entitled to rejoice directly in the revealed love of God, but is ever kept at a distance by the inquiry whether he has, indeed, savingly complied with the conditions required of him. But, though on the one-system, the denying that the atonement has been for all, and on the other system the denying that the atonement has accomplished remission of sins for all, have led to separating between the certainty of a truth of God's word, and the certainty of our own personal interest in his love, it is manifest, that where neither of these errors is held, but the true character of the atonement as to its extent and its meaning, is recognised, there can be no indulgence extended to any uncertainty in the individual, as to his personal interest in all the promises of God, revealed to be believed; nor can the darkness, or deadness, or want of enjoyment in God, of any one within hearing of the sound of the gospel, be ascribed to any other cause than the direct disbelief of that which the mouth of the Lord hath spoken. It is obvious, therefore, that with the views of the work of God in Christ, above stated, I must ever seek to make my hearers feel themselves placed between the alternatives of, on the one hand, believing God, and rejoicing in his love, as that of a reconciled Father in Christ; or, on the other, remaining uncertain of God's love to them, *through making God a liar*—so that I can never allow any place to the distinction—"I do not doubt God, I only doubt myself" or any similar expression, by which people have lined out for themselves a middle space between dwelling in the light of God's love, and underlying the condemnation of rejecting God's truth.—That *imaginary* middle space is, alas, but too fearfully crowded with the multitudes of perishing sinners, who are slumbering in the *fancied* security of their lowly estimate of themselves, and saying peace, peace, to their own souls, on the strange ground, that they are not so presumptuous as to think that they have a certain foundation for peace.

As the doctrine which I hold on the subject of assurance of faith, so necessarily arises out of the other two doctrines, which I have already vindicated from the charge of being contrary to the Holy Scriptures; and as any one who will be satisfied with that vindication will not feel any need of additional quotations here; and as any one not satisfied with it, can only make an exception in favour of this doctrine of assurance, on ~~grounds~~ which I would not take, and do not think to the glory of God, (I refer to what is so often said, that Christ is freely offered, that it is kept secret for whom he died; but that the freeness of the offer is a sufficient foundation for an appropriating act of faith in us,) not desiring, I say, the admission of the doctrine of assurance on any such ground, and wishing rather it should appear, as is the truth, to stand or fall with the doctrines now stated on the subject of atonement and remission of sins, I would close this part of my answer to the libel, with a few words to prevent misconception, on a subject, often confounded with that of assurance of faith, but nevertheless quite distinct from it.

The subject to which I refer, is the assurance of being in a state of salvation; an assurance having reference to the distinction between believers and unbelievers—converted and unconverted—regenerate and unregenerate persons; and the object of which is the fact concerning the individual, that he himself belongs now to the class of saved ones. It is obviously quite a different contemplation, to be beholding the glory of God's holy forgiveness shining in the face of Jesus Christ, and reflecting it back with the response of the Spirit of adoption, crying, Abba, Father, which is the condition of assurance of Faith, from being looking inward on oneself, and comparing the past with the present, and gathering the points of contrast between them, saying to oneself, whereas I was once blind, now I see—whereas I was dead, I now live—whereas I was a

stranger to the commonwealth of Israel, I am now a fellow-citizen with the saints, and of the household of God.

It is no doubt, when abounding in the assurance of faith, that, if the eye turns inwardly, and the thoughts are directed to our own state, we shall also enjoy the assurance of being in a state of salvation ; but still the two assurances are distinct in themselves, and I at present feel it to be important to refer to the distinction, because, whilst I hold assurance to be of the essence of faith, I do not hold that the converted person is necessarily *always* in a condition of assurance as to his being in a state of salvation ; inasmuch as I do not hold it to be impossible for a converted person to be, *at times*, so overcome of the temptations of Satan, causing darkness, through the flesh, as it may be to stand in doubt of the first principles of the oracles of God ; and it is manifest that if brought into such darkness, and such unbelief, there must be the interruption to the blessed consciousness of being a child of God, and an heir of glory.

I say, I refer to this subject, although there is no reference to it in the libel, desiring that my views on these subjects, in their relation to each other, should be distinctly understood. If this present recognition of the possibility of interruption of the sense of adoption, be understood, as in any way qualifying what I have already said as to the nature of faith, when it is in exercise, I shall regret it—in my own mind, I see the *widest possible distinction* between the admission that a regenerate person may, for a time, be so overcome of Satan, as to stand in doubt of that truth which is the anchor of his soul, and *in this way* lose the consciousness of security—and the assumption, that without any doubt at all of the word of God, and while not hesitating to admit all that is there spoken of Christ—the assumption, that, in such a case, a man may consistently say, that he doubts whether he himself has an interest in the love of God—and I believe, that the mind that draws

back from the demand for assurance, and feels it to be some relief to be told that one may be saved without it, will not welcome it as any concession, to have it admitted that, in the way of doubting the direct testimony of God, there may be an occasional season of darkness and uncertainty, from falling into this awful sin.

I have now concluded all that I have felt it expedient, for the present, to say, in reference to the statement that the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon, through the death of Christ, as also, that the doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, are contrary to the Holy Scriptures; and have sought to rest the matter on this ground, that either these expressions are intended to state doctrines *which I do not hold*, in which case I need not be careful to consider them—or, that assuming them to express what I do hold, the assertion that they contain any thing contrary to Scripture, *is untrue*, and the libel consequently irrelevant—I trust I have been enabled to be explicit in my statements, and that my brethren are put in a condition to judge me with reference to the substantial truth of what I hold and teach, and not with reference to any ambiguous and unexplained form of words; and I trust also that they will be enabled to judge, unfettered by any previous impressions, which the discussions connected with these views may have made; and if, after all, the distinctions which I have sought to mark, be not sufficiently broad or apparent to strike *at once*, that they will not withhold that measure of patient consideration, which may be needed to put them in full possession of my meaning.

II. I now proceed to consider the question of relevancy on the several points of doctrine above mentioned, *with reference to the Standards of the Church.*

To defend any doctrine from the charge of being contrary to the Confession of Faith of any church, differs from

the defence of a doctrine from a similar charge in reference to the Scriptures, in these two important respects, that whereas no doctrine is to be preached, of which there is no explicit statement in the Word of God, many doctrines may be taught, as found in the Word of God, concerning which a Confession of Faith may be silent; and inasmuch as while the Scriptures must be held as of unlimited authority, equally in respect of the language they use, as in respect of the matter expressed, a Confession of Faith is only received and approved of "as to the truth of the matter."

In reference to the doctrines in this libel, declared to be inconsistent with the Standards of the Church, I would reply as to the first, the doctrine of Universal Atonement and Pardon through the death of Christ, that the utmost that can be said in support of the charge, is that the present Confession of Faith is silent on the subject; but this, though it were fully admitted, would in truth be nothing on which to found. As to the second doctrine, that Assurance is of the essence of Faith, it is substantially stated in the definition of Faith given; and the impression that it is otherwise, has only arisen from confounding together the distinct subjects of Assurance of Faith and Assurance of being in a state of Salvation.

*First.* In respect of the first, I am aware that the peculiar use of the word *redemption*, though not altogether unsanctioned by Scripture usage, has occasioned the impression to exist very generally, that the universality of the Atonement is denied, and I shall now state my reasons for holding this to be a serious error. This I judge both from the consideration of the passages that are so misunderstood, and also from the history of the drawing up of the Confession of Faith, and its relation to former Confessions.

The first of the passages to which I refer, is Confes. chap. iii. sect. 6. which is in the following words, "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he by the eternal



and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereto; wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

Now if *redemption* in this passage mean the work of atonement done in the person of Christ, the shedding of his blood for the remission of sins, then is there here an express limitation of the Atonement; by if by *redemption* be meant, the actual deliverance of those, with reference to whom it is spoken, from a state of evil into a state of salvation, and be thus of the same import with *Salvation*, then is it a statement not affecting the extent of the Atonement at all, and merely amounting to this, that the persons ultimately saved are those and those alone originally elected of God unto Salvation.

Now, that this is the true view of the passage is manifest from the contrast of a *fall* into an *evil state* and *deliverance from that evil state*, contained in the words, "Wherefore they who are elected, being *fallen* in Adam are *redeemed* by Christ;" which is farther manifest from the proofs adduced in support of the doctrine of their being redeemed by Christ, in all of which the deliverance or salvation accomplished is that to which reference is made; they are these, 1 Thess. v. 9—11, "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain *Salvation* by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should *live* together with him."—Titus ii. 14, "Who gave himself for us, that he *might redeem us* from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." Accordingly we have, that the Elect are "effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season,

are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power, through faith unto salvation," given as the parts of the work of their redemption by Christ. The first of the proofs adduced for these links in the chain of redemption is that corresponding enumeration of links connecting God's foreknowledge of his elect with their ultimate glory, given in the Epistle to the Romans, viii. 30, which I have already noticed in considering the statements of Scripture on the subject of election, as implying the universality of the Atonement.

The next passage to which I refer, Confess. chap. viii. sect. 8, is in these words, "To all those for whom Christ purchased redemption he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same, making intercession for them, and revealing unto them in and by the word, the mysteries of salvation; effectually persuading them by his Spirit to believe and obey, and governing their hearts by his Word and Spirit, overcoming all their enemies by his Almighty Power and Wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation."

This passage clearly establishes the interpretation I have given above of the word *redemption* as used in our Standards as the true one. Redemption cannot mean, the paying of a price, or the giving himself a ransom, seeing that it is here spoken of as a thing purchased, and the account given, of the manner in which Christ doth apply and communicate redemption, is clearly the detail of a personal deliverance from evils, of those to whom it is applied.

The next passage is in the Larger Cat. Quest. 59, "Who are made partakers of redemption through Christ? Ans. Redemption is certainly applied, and effectually communicated to all those for whom Christ has purchased it, who are, in time, enabled by the Holy Ghost to believe in Christ according to the Gospel." It is manifest that the

word *redemption* here has the same meaning of personal deliverance from sin and all its consequences in this passage, which we have found attached to it in those formerly quoted ; and that the question, “ Who are made partakers of redemption through Christ,” is the same with the question, “ Who are made partakers of Salvation ?” or, “ Who are saved through Christ ?” This examination of these three passages, and they are those quoted on the subject in the Act of Assembly 1720, surely justifies the conclusion, that it is a decided error to hold that our present Confession of Faith denies the doctrine of Universal Atonement and Pardon through the death of Christ.

The silence of the Confession on this subject, were it even to be interpreted in the most unfavourable way as to the opinions held regarding it by those who drew up this Confession, yea, were it even known, historically, that the prevailing opinion among these persons, was that the Atonement was limited—even in such a case, the silence of the Confession on the subject would be felt to be a cause of thankfulness by every one who understood the awful sin which the Church would have incurred by denouncing so important a part of the truth of God ; a sin, of which if she had been guilty, it would have amounted to little, if any thing, short of solemn apostasy. I am not aware, however, that any branch of the church of Christ, of the many into which it formed itself at the Reformation, has been stained with this guilt ; on the contrary, the general tone of all the earlier Confessions has been the acknowledgment of the love of God in Christ as a love to all men : but that the silence of our present Confession may not be interpreted to its discredit, I would consider its history with reference to the previous Confessions to which it is immediately related, and more especially with reference to the act of Parliament by which the Assembly that drew it up was called together. The Confessions to which I refer are the 39

Articles of the Church of England, with special reference to which it must be understood; and also the older Confession of our own Church, to which it is importantly related; seeing that it was received "*as in nothing contrary thereto*,"—they are the symbols of doctrine of the Church of England, however, which are specially to be considered; seeing that the act of Parliament appointing the Assembly of Divines at Westminster is entitled, "An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons, assembled in Parliament, for the calling of an assembly of learned and Godly Divines and others, to be consulted with by the Parliament, for the settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing the Doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations." There was thus given to that Assembly a deliberative power as to settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England; while as to Doctrine, the duty devolved upon them, and the trust reposed in them, extended no farther than the *vindicating und clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations*. We are therefore to expect no *new* Doctrine in the Westminster Confession of Faith, other than that contained in the previous Articles and Catechisms of the Church of England; a more guarded expression, and a fuller dwelling upon any point that had been under misrepresentation, we may expect, but certainly nothing new as touching the foundations.

Now we find in the Articles of the Church of England these statements on the extent of the Atonement:—In the 2d Article, entitled, "Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very man," Christ is spoken of as one "Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."—Again, in the 31st Article, entitled, "Of the one oblation of Christ finished

upon the Cross," we read, "The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for All the sins of the Whole World, both original and Actual; and there is none other Satisfaction for Sin but that alone."—Again, in the Catechism appointed by the Church of England to be learned in preparation for Confirmation, we have the following question and answers appended to the Apostles' Creed—"Quest. What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy belief? Ans. *First.* I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the World. *Secondly.* In God the Son, who hath redeemed me and *all mankind.* *Thirdly.* In God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the Elect People of God."

Now is it to be held for a moment that an Assembly appointed with no other authority, in respect of these Articles of the Church of England, than simply that of vindicating them from misrepresentation; and consisting of men a great proportion of whom must have subscribed to these very Articles, would have proceeded, in the face of the ordinance of their appointment, to draw up Articles flatly denying these fundamental points of the Creed of their Church; and that too without the slightest hint given that they were conscious that they were taking upon themselves to change in any respect that Creed.

But farther, that such statements on the subject of the dealing of God with the Elect, as I have quoted above from the Westminster Confession of Faith, are consistent with the Doctrine of Universal Atonement, and must have been regarded as consistent with it by those who drew up the Confession, is manifest from this, that in the very 39 Articles of the Church of England in which the Doctrine of the Universality of the Atonement is so strongly and pointedly stated, the doctrine held on the subject of Predestination and Election is precisely the same with that in the Westminster Confession of Faith; insomuch, that were

the Article on the extent of the Atonement not given, it would have appeared just as natural to infer that the compilers of the Article on Election, denied the Universality of the Atonement, as it has appeared to many that the Article on Election in our present Confession does. These are the words, "Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling:—they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by Adoption: they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.\*

Now, with the exception of not using the word *redemption*, but with the full expression of the meaning attached to it in our Confession, this Article is precisely the same. —If any difficulty should be suggested by the use of the word *redemption*, and not atonement, in the articles above quoted, the least inspection will satisfy that the word there has the meaning of *oblation for sin*, and not of *personal deliverance*, as in our Confession. Why the Westminster Divines should have directed their attention to the work of God for the elect, and not have re-recorded the statements of *their* Church regarding what has been done for the non-elect, it may not be easy to ascertain; but seeing they were appointed to vindicate the doctrine of the Church from misrepresentation, and seeing that one misrepresentation to

\* Article 17th.

which the Articles of the Church of England have been often subjected, has been that they savoured of Arminianism, and interfered with the integrity of the doctrine of Election; and seeing that the caution on the subject of teaching Election, appended to the Church of England Articles on that subject, might have favoured misapprehension in the matter, we may obtain from this some key to the apparent difference in the tone of the 39 Articles from that of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and to the great prominence given to the subject of Election in the latter.

This argument appears to me quite conclusive as to the light in which we are to view the Westminster Confession of Faith, *as it came to us from England*; and the terms on which it was received by us is in no respect a weakening of the evidence, for it was received "*As in nothing contrary to the received doctrine of this Kirk.*" Now, that doctrine was the doctrine of the Confession of 1560, and of the Palatine Catechism then in use in the Church.\* The doctrine of that Catechism may be established by the following question and answer: "Quest. 37. What believest thou when thou sayest, He suffered? Ans. That in the whole time of his life which he continued here upon earth, but especially in the end thereof, he sustained, both in body and in soul, the wrath of God against the *sinne of all mankind.*"† The Confession of 1560, though in its general tone it corresponds with the present Confession, in setting forth, almost exclusively, the history of God's dealing with the elect, yet doth it not only not contain any expression that can possibly be construed into a limitation of the atonement, but hath in it the following words, in which the universality of the sacrifice offered by Christ is recognised:

\* In proof of this, *vide* Wodrow's Dedication of his History to, the King.

† Palatine Catechism.

“ But yet we avow that he remained the only well-beloved and blessed Sonne of his Father, even in the midst of his anguish and torment, quhilk hee suffered in bodie and saule to mak the full satisfioun for the sinnes of the people.”\* A Latin translation of this Confession was executed, at the desire of the Kirk, by Patrick Adamson, in which the words now founded upon are thus rendered: “ Ut peccata hominum plene lucret.”†—There is an older Confession—that “ used in the English congregation at Geneva, received and approved by the Church of Scotland in the beginning of the Reformation,” which, though afterwards superseded by that of 1560, is not unimportant in reference to the present question, inasmuch as it was the Confession that must have been previously used by John Knox and other compilers of that of 1560—it thus speaks of the work of Christ: “ Thus of his free mercie, without compulsion, he offered up himself as the onlie sacrifice to purge the sins of all the world.”

On the whole subject of the views entertained of the work of Christ, both in the churches of England and Scotland, *up* to the time, and *at* the time of the drawing up of our present Confession,—there is an important evidence of the fact, that there was in no quarter any limitation of the extent of the atonement, furnished to us in the readiness with which the members of the Church of England, who held its extent so explicitly, signed, along with their brethren of Scotland, the National Covenant, in which the existing doctrine of the Church of Scotland is so distinctly recognised; while the only points of discussion which seemed to arise at their signing of the Covenant, were those which arose upon the subject of Church Government.

I trust, then, that it has been made abundantly manifest, that there is no apology for conceiving of our Church as having at any time, either in the wording of her Standards,

\* Article IX. † *Vide* Dunlop's Collection of Confessions, vol. ii.



or in the meaning of those who drew them up, denied the universality of the atonement.

*Second.* In respect to the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation. While there is ~~not~~ for the reason assigned above, much *direct* statement on the subject to be found in the Scriptures, the records of the Protestant Church peculiarly abound in pointed and strong testimonies in its favour; insomuch that it is far easier to multiply proofs that the Protestant Church has everywhere held, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and that personal confidence towards God, as the ~~the~~ *giver* of our sins, is *inseparable* from the reception of the Gospel, than that they held THAT doctrine of Universal Atonement and Pardon through the death of Christ, which alone furnish a reasonable foundation for such assurance.—The explanation of this fact is, that the error of the Roman Catholic Church was not the limitation of the death of Christ, as to extent, but the denial that the knowledge of it was enough to perfect the conscience, and give peace and confidence towards God: therefore the Reformers were at peculiar pains to vindicate the sacrifice of Christ from the imputation of incompleteness, which the Popish doctrine of a necessity for some additional ground of peace, cast upon it: and it is striking, and most instructive, to find the same kind of reasoning, which I have already noticed in speaking of the pardon of sin, as made use of by the Apostle, in the tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, adopted in arguing against the sacrifice of masses, and every thing else by which the all-sufficiency and completeness of the one oblation offered by Christ upon the cross, was brought into question—the Apostle argues, sacrifices are not repeated because this one sacrifice has put away all sin, so that there is no longer any sin standing in need of remission—they argued that sacrifices of any kind ought not to be offered, because the “*offering of Christ was that perfect redemption,*

*propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual."*

The one point of doctrine, indeed, which marks the Reformation, and which was the basis of the Protestant Church, was the all-sufficiency of the knowledge of Christ crucified to give peace of conscience, and assured confidence towards God. The Confessions of Faith which the several branches of the reformed Church drew up, all record this fact. And seeing how later Confessions have ever been received as in nothing contrary to those which had preceded them—and how the Reformation Church conceived of herself as one Church, in respect of doctrine (while reluctantly recognising a diversity in Church Government), I would feel it no irrelevant argument in this present question to quote the authority of the Reformed Church, as a body, establishing what that authority sanctioned by the language of the various Standards.

It may be sufficient, however, to refer to what are peculiarly the Standards of our Church: and as I see that in the Act of Assembly 1720, the chapter in the Westminster Confession, on the subject of Assurance of being in a state of Salvation, as quoted with application to the subject of Assurance of Faith, I would remind my brethren, that it is the subject of Assurance of FAITH, that, at present engages their attention.

The following is the definition of Faith in the Westminster Confession, chap. xiv. sect. 2, "By this faith the Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein; and acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises, of God for this life and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sancti-

fication, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace."

It is manifest, that here, faith is the believing to be true whatever God hath spoken, with that assurance of its truth which corresponds with its authority, as spoken by God himself; and that this belief is supposed to be accompanied with "the feelings which the thing believed is fitted to awaken; and more particularly, in respect of Christ, the feeling of accepting, receiving, and resting upon him for justification, sanctification, and eternal life."—There is here no colour given to the distinction, commonly made, between doubting God and doubting ourselves. The promises are evidently supposed, being believed, to inspire the confidence which they were intended to impart; and, although the expressions which follow, as to degrees of faith, and the assaults to which faith is exposed, may seem to give some sanction to the apology made for living in uncertainty as to God's love and favour towards us; yet, being rightly considered, do they imply nothing more than that liability to sin against God, by doubting his word, of which all the children of God are conscious, and which they daily lament, with confessions, far removed from the ignorant and self-complacent feeling with which uncertainty of the love of God, and of a personal interest in the work of Christ is avowed, by persons professing the most unhesitating confidence in the truth of the word of God, and so exculpating themselves altogether from the charge of unbelief, or even weakness of faith; while they insinuate that their want of assurance arises from their humble estimate of their own religious attainments.

The definition of the Larger Catechism asserteth, "that, in justifying faith, there is not only an assent to the truth of the promise of the Gospel, but a receiving and resting upon Christ and his righteousness therein held forth, for pardon of sin, and for the accepting and accounting of his

person righteous, in the sight of God, for salvation."—And in the Shorter Catechism we are taught, "that we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation, as he is offered to us in the Gospel."—The words, "receiving and resting," thus occurring both in the Confession and in the two Catechisms of our Church, if we attach their natural meaning to the words, certainly teach us that assurance is of the essence of faith—to hold otherwise, is to hold that we may receive Christ as a Saviour and yet not put trust in him *as one*—yea, that we may *rest* upon him, and yet it be no rest.

But lest there should be any hesitation in recognising this as the true interpretation of our later Standards, let us consider the older ones, with reference to which they were received "as being in nothing contrary" to the previously received doctrine of the Church.

"Regeneration is wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost working in the hartes of the elect of God *and assured faith in the promise of God reveild to us in his word, by which faith we apprehend Christ Jesus with the graces and benefits promised in him.*"—*Old Confession Art. 3.*

In Calvin's Catechism—used by the Church of Scotland and approved by the first Book of Discipline—a question is put, What is further required besides our placing confidence in God, and having an assured knowledge that he is Almighty and perfectly good? The answer is in these words, "That every one of us be *fully assured* in his conscience *that he is beloved of God*, and that he will be both his Father and his Saviour." Again, it thus defines "*a right faith*:" It is "a sure persuasion of God's tender love towards *us*, according as he hath plainly uttered in his gospel, and that he will be both a Father and a Saviour unto us through the means of Christ."

In the Palatine Catechism already referred to—in answer to the question, "What is true faith?" it is replied, "It is

not only a knowledge, by which I *steadfastly* assent to all things which God hath revealed unto us in his word, but also an *assured affiance*, kindled in my heart by the Holy Ghost, through the gospel, by which I *rest* upon God, *making sure account* that forgiveness of sins, everlasting righteousness, and life, is bestowed *not only* upon others, *but also upon me*, and that freely, by the mercy of God, for the merit and desert of Christ alone."

In the Solemn League and Covenant there is this declaration, "We detest and refuse the usurped authority of the Roman Antichrist—his *general and doubtful faith*."

And after these quotations from the authorised standards of our Church, I may surely ask my Brethren to come to this conclusion, that to preach and to teach the doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, is in no respect to do any thing inconsistent with the obligations under which I have come, as a minister of the Church of Scotland.

I shall conclude this part of my answers to the libel, with two extracts from the writings, on this subject, of ministers of our Church; who, in teaching that doctrine of assurance for which I am now called in question, not only met with the toleration of the Church, but received the highest esteem of the most holy of her members. The first extract is from the Notes of the Rev. Thomas Boston to the Marrow of Modern Divinity. "And the doctrine of assurance or an appropriating persuasion in saving faith, as it is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, Rom. x. 9. Acts xv. 11. Gal. ii. 20. so it is a Protestant doctrine, taught by Protestant Divines against the Papists; sealed with the blood of Martyrs, in Popish flames; it is the doctrine of reformed churches abroad, and the doctrine of the Church of Scotland."

My other extract is from the work of the late Dr. Colquhoun of Leith, on Faith. Treating of assurance, he says—"There are two different kinds of assurance, the assu-

ance of *faith* and the assurance of *sense*. The former kind belongs to the *essence* of faith. It is *essential* to saving faith, and is nothing but faith itself." Again, "This particular trust, or confidence in the Saviour for Salvation, is what our Reformers from Popery called the *assurance of faith*: and *by it* they usually describe saving faith."—"For my part," says he, "I am utterly at a loss to know what trusting in the Saviour for salvation can mean, unless it means *my trusting that he will perform the part of a Saviour to me.*"

I might have quoted rather from the early founders of the Church, and in their writings I would have found expressions of the truth more entirely in harmony with those which I myself would choose—thus Patrick Hamilton, the first martyr in Scotland for the doctrines of the Reformation, says, "And they that believe not that their sins are forgiven them, and that they shall be saved for Christ's sake, they believe not the gospel." But I have chosen rather these fathers of a later age, because it is ground of much thankfulness to be able to trace the Reformation testimony down to our own time, and to know, that however much the Church hath fallen from the ground she once occupied, she has not yet interdicted any of her ministers from preaching that truth, through the faithful testifying to which she was at first brought into being, and that however much her departure from her original pure tone of feeling has been painfully recorded in the Act of Assembly of 1720, not yet testified against by any subsequent Assembly, yet hath she not as yet, by any overt act of oppression for the truth's sake brought upon herself the guilt—the highest with which as a Church she could be stained—of taking away the Key of Knowledge, not only not entering in herself, but those who would enter in, hindering—of ceasing from discharging her high office as the pillar and ground of the truth, and lending herself to Satan for the

work of darkening counsel, and shutting the mouths of those who have held forth the word of life—I say, it is cause of thankfulness that the Reformation doctrine of assurance of faith hath been even to so recent a date, preached and published by men having high esteem among her ministers.—How long such a testimony may be borne to her, it is not for me to anticipate. I desire, as a faithful son of the Church, to commit it to the Lord, who doth not visit us as we deserve, neither rewardeth us according to our iniquities.

I have now submitted to my Brethren all that appeared important to me to state upon the relevancy of this libel, in reference to the Scriptures and Standards of the Church. The importance of the subject, in every light in which I can regard it, would have justified to my mind even a more lengthened statement: the more especially that I almost take for granted that the question of relevancy will be the only question, and that there will be no occasion to lead any proof; seeing that all that is true, I am desirous myself distinctly to state. It may be, now, farther, right to take some notice of the minor proposition, and the several specific allegations into which it is broken down.

I would say, generally, that I cannot recognise the exact expressions used as having been employed by me: that some of them are *substantially* such as I might have used, and that others, I am satisfied, I have not used, and they are such as would give an erroneous conception of what I teach. The first occasion specified\* is my preaching in the Floating Chapel in Greenock, in April last; on which occasion I did fully set forth the doctrine which I have already stated in these answers, both with regard to pardon and judgment; but I cannot know, with any certainty, whether in the words quoted in the libel. The same sermon is largely quoted from under the Tenth Count, and

\* Counts 1st and 10th.

will be seen by the reverend Presbytery to have within it evidence, that to a considerable extent is likely to be accurate, seeing that it so far harmonizes with the doctrines which I have stated myself to hold and teach—but as my sermons have been for a considerable time past, preached without any previous writing, my brethren will not be surprised that I can make no more pointed reply to these charges.

The Second Count refers to the sermon which I preached by appointment, before the Reverend Presbytery, the 8th of July last. The first two statements ascribed to me, are similar to those which I have already admitted in Presbytery, so far as I recognise them—the third statement distinctly conveys an idea, which I did not express or entertain.

The third count seems to me in every part of it to be untrue, some of the words or members of sentences seem not unlike such as I may have used; but the ideas conveyed by the sentences, taken entire, are such as I have never taught.

The Fourth Count I do not recognise in words; and in so far as it is true, it corresponds with what I have stated above on the subject of assurance of faith.

I do not recognise the Fifth Count, nor do I believe that I have ever so expressed myself.

As to the sixth count, I do not admit what is here charged unless the Reverend Presbytery will understand, the testifying to the people, that none ought to go to the Communion table, unless they were in a condition to commemorate the love of Christ, as love to themselves individually, to be tantamount to it.

The Seventh Count begins with a statement which I do not recognise; but I am not certain that I may not have used words not unlike these—but the second statement I utterly deny.



The Eighth Count contains a statement which I never made.

I do not recognise all the statements in the *Ninth* Count, indeed not one of them is precisely such as I would have made ; and though I can gather from them, what the doctrine was, that I must, on that occasion, have been setting forth, I am certain these expressions do not, accurately or truly, convey what was taught.

The Tenth Count has been noticed already along with the first.

Upon the whole, I do not know that any of the expressions contained in the minor proposition of this libel would convey, by themselves, an accurate conception of the doctrines which were taught, on the occasions on which they were said to have been used ; but having taken notice of them all, with as much precision as the case admits of, I now leave the whole matter in the hands of the Reverend Presbytery, looking to God, with earnest prayer, that they may be enabled to deliberate in this most important matter for the glory of God, and the good of his Church.

*In respect whereof, &c.*

JOHN M'L. CAMPBELL, Minister of Row.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PRESBYTERY OF  
DUMBARTON.

---

At Dumbarton, the twenty-first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years.

After prayer by Mr. Carr, Moderator,

Sederunt—Messrs. Wilson, Graham, Hamilton, Gregor, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Niven, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers ; with Mr. Dunlop, Elder, from Cardross, and Mr. Peter Jardine from Dumbarton.

(*Inter alia.*) The Clerk reported that he had sent Mr. [redacted] a copy of the libel given into the Presbytery by Mr. M. George, with the list of witnesses, and a copy of the productions in aid of proof.

The Presbytery officer produced a written execution of summons against Mr. Campbell to this diet, bearing date the ninth day of September, current—subscribed by the officer and two witnesses to the delivery of said libel, with the list of witnesses subjoined, and a copy of the productions, in aid of proof, which was read, and is *in retentis*.

The officer was then ordered to call the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, Minister of Row. Mr. Campbell accordingly appeared for himself. The libellers of Mr. Campbell were then called. Compeared Messrs. John Thompson, A. Lennox, George M'Lellan, and Peter Turner ; with Mr. M'George, as their agent.

The libel was then read over, when Mr. Campbell gave in written answers to said libel, which were read, and ordered to be kept *in retentis*.

Parties were then heard on the relevancy at full length, and removed.

The Presbytery having considered said libel, and being well and ripely advised, did, and hereby do find the major proposition of said libel relevant.

Parties being called in, this judgment was intimated to them.

From which judgment Mr. Story dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be given in, in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

Against which judgment, Mr. Campbell protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be lodged in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

In the above judgment, Mr. M'George, in name of the libellers, declared his acquiescence, took instruments, and craved extracts.

It being now past seven o'clock, the Presbytery agree to adjourn till to-morrow morning, to meet in the same place, at ten o'clock—to which diet Mr. Campbell and the libellers were summoned *apud acta* by the Moderator.

---

REASONS OF PROTEST AND APPEAL, by JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL, Minister of Row, against a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, pronounced on the twenty-first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years, relating to a Libel against the Appellant, at the instance of George M'Lellan, and others, designing themselves heads of families, and inhabitants of the parish of Row, by which judgment the Presbytery found the major proposition of said Libel relevant.

I. There is an indefiniteness in the proposition thus found relevant, in that while it states certain doctrines to be contrary to the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church, it does not specify passages in the Scriptures, or in the Standards, in proof of this assertion ;—which occasions the greater ambiguity, inasmuch as the Standards of the Church nowhere define or even employ the terms in which this proposition is expressed. It becomes, therefore, an important objection to the judgment of the Presbytery, that it simply finds the pro-

position in question relevant, without adding such explanations as would make it apparent in what sense the Presbytery understood its terms, or on what grounds, in reference to the Scriptures and the Standards, they held it to be relevant.

II. In the Answers to the libel, which were given in to the Presbytery, various senses in which some of the terms of this proposition have been employed were stated—and the admission made, on the part of the appellant, that taking these terms in some of these senses, the proposition *was* relevant; while taking them in other of these senses, it was submitted, that it was *quite irrelevant* and *untrue*. Hence arose a further and very imperative reason, why the finding of the Presbytery ought to have been more explicit;—and the appellant feels aggrieved, in that, at this moment, he does not know in what sense the Presbytery have understood this proposition, while declaring it relevant as the major proposition of a libel concluding for his deposition from the Ministry.

III. Assuming the interpretation of the terms of this proposition, according to which the appellant has admitted, in the Answers to the libel, that it states doctrines which he holds and teaches, to be that adopted by the Presbytery in pronouncing the judgment appealed from, then, in that case, that judgment is objected to and appealed from, and held to be one which the superior Court ought to reverse, inasmuch as it declares doctrines to be contrary to the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church, of which it may with truth be said, that they are what the Scriptures principally teach—and that they are not only not contrary to the Standards, but are implied in, and are the basis of all that they teach and set forth as the life of God in man.

In respect whereof, &c.

(Signed)

JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL,  
Minister of Row.

Row, October 1st, 1830.

At Dumbarton, the twenty-second day of September, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years.

After prayer by Mr. Carr, Moderator, the Presbytery met, pursuant to adjournment.

Sederunt—Messrs. Graham, Hamilton, Gregor, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers; with Mr. Dunlop, elder from Cardross.

Minutes of yesterday's Sederunt were read.

The Presbytery resumed consideration of the case from Row.

Parties being called, compeared Mr. Campbell for himself.

Of the libellers, there compeared Messrs. Geo. M'Lellan, and John Thomson; with Mr. M'George, as their agent.

The libel was again read over, with Mr. Campbell's answers to the different articles.

The Presbytery agree to consider the counts of said libel *seriatim*.

The first count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said first count relevant, with the exception of the proposition "there could be no judgment to come, unless there had been pardon to come."

The second count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said second count relevant, with the exception of the proposition—"in speaking of the words in the fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel, 'Blessed are they that mourn:' you said that the causes of this mourning were not within the believer, his sins having been taken away, but they existed outwardly in the unbelief and sinfulness of the world."

The third count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said third count relevant,

The fourth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said fourth count relevant.

The fifth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said fifth count relevant. •

The sixth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said sixth count relevant.

The seventh count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said seventh count *not* relevant.

The eighth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said eighth count relevant.

The ninth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said ninth count relevant, with the exception of the propositions—"that the curse in Adam extended only to the death of the body, and takes effect upon all;" and "that if Christ had not died, mankind would not have risen, nor would they have gone to hell, to eternal punishment, but to Hades."

The tenth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the following proposition in said tenth count, *videlicet*: "Now, inasmuch as it is true concerning you, that in the first place the work of God in Christ has put away your sins, so that it is the fact, that your sins are at this moment not imputed to you"—taken in connexion with the following—"that sinners as you are, that deserving of condemnation, and by nature under condemnation as you are," is relevant, as is also the proposition; "that the principle upon which Christ judges the earth, is, that Christ has redeemed us;"—and also the propositions, "that the judg-

ment presupposes forgiveness ;" and " that it is as those who have been forgiven that we judged shall be." Find the other propositions of the said tenth count *not* relevant.

From the above findings of the Presbytery, Mr. Dunlop dissented. Mr. Story also dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts. Against the above findings, Mr. Campbell protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments and craved extracts.

In which findings, Mr. M'George, in name of the libellers, acquiesced, took instruments, and craved extracts.

The Presbytery appoint the Moderator, and Messrs. Graham, Hamilton, Fleming, and A. Sym, a Committee; Dr. Fleming, Convener, and three a quorum, to answer Mr. Campbell's Reasons of Appeal, and Mr. Story's Dissent and Complaint, and to defend the judgments of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

REASONS OF PROTEST AND APPEAL, by JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL, Minister of Row, against the judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, pronounced on the 22d day of September, 1830, in reference to the libel against the Appellant, at the instance of George M'Lellan, and others, designing themselves heads of families, and inhabitants of the parish of Row, by which judgment the Presbytery found the several counts of the minor proposition of said libel, with the exception of a few sentences, relevant.

Having, in the Answers to the libel, stated generally, of its minor proposition, that none of its counts did truly and intelligibly, and without explanation, convey the doctrines which were taught on the occasions on which the several expressions quoted are said to have been used; and having given a particular denial to most of these expressions, it is

manifestly not incumbent upon the appellant,—nor indeed consistent with the ground which he has thus taken, that he should minutely consider whether expressions which he has never used, and which can at the most be but imperfect quotations, are, or are not, relevant to prove any thing. Yet there are, without so examining the minor proposition, certain reasons of appeal against the Presbytery's judgment, as one by which the Appellant is aggrieved.

I. Assuming the objections taken against the indefinite character of the Presbytery's judgment, in reference to the major proposition, to be just and tenable, then the Presbytery were not in a condition to proceed to a consideration of the relevancy of the minor, without doing injustice to the appellant. It is manifest that if it is impossible to know certainly what the Presbytery understand to be contained in the major proposition, while finding it relevant, it must be also impossible to know what the precise charge is, which the minor is found relevant to prove:—so that the appellant may truly say, that he does not know what the minor proposition is intended to prove against him, or what the charge is, which he has to meet.

II. The judgment now appealed from, is not only one thus placing the appellant *substantially* in the situation of being subjected to a trial on an unknown charge,—that is substantially without being libelled, but in so far as the Presbytery's understanding of the major proposition may be gathered from their judgment on the minor, and the charge which they contemplate thus inferred, the appellant objects that the interpretation which seems put upon the major is altogether inadmissible, and consequently the judgment now appealed from unwarranted. In the findings relative to the minor proposition, it appears to be the assurance of being in a state of salvation that the Presbytery are contemplating—while there is no mention of that doctrine in the major proposition, which refers to no assurance but that known by the name of



assurance of faith. This appears to the appellant a most insuperable objection, inasmuch as it makes the charge sent to proof, so far as it can be understood, not the charge libelled at all.

III. While there is thus not only want of definiteness, but also important misconception in the Presbytery's judgment, in that the minor proposition of the libel is found relevant to prove what is not stated in the major, there is a still further proof of misconception furnished by the consideration of a part of that matter which the Presbytery have cast out of the minor proposition as irrelevant. The greater proportion of the tenth count is thrown out. Now this tenth count contains the nearest approximation to an intelligent statement of the doctrines taught by the appellant to be found in the libel, and therefore ought to be the most relevant, if the major proposition be understood in that sense, according to which the appellant has admitted that he holds and teaches the doctrines which it states. This is an important fact ;— and the consideration of it, and of the manifest misconception on the subject of assurance, must surely satisfy the superior Court, that the objections taken to the Presbytery's judgment, in respect of want of explicitness, is not urged in any captious spirit. Substantial justice is all that is sought—but proceeding with the trial in such darkness, and under such misconception, the Appellant may eventually find himself deposed from the Ministry for teaching, not only what he never held, but what he never has been libelled for holding.

In respect whereof,

(Signed) JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL.  
Minister of Row.

Row, October 2d, 1880.

At Dumbarton, the fifth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and thirty.

After prayer by Mr. Carr, Moderator,

Sederunt—Messrs. Wilson, Graham, Hamilton, Gregor, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Niven, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers ; with Mr. Dunlop, Elder, from Cardross, and Mr. Peter Jardine from Dumbarton.

(*Inter alia.*) Mr. Campbell being judicially asked if he adhered to his Answers to the libel given in against him, declared he did adhere to the same.

Being asked if he had any addition or explanation to make to these Answers—replied, that understanding this question to have reference to his personal judgment of the explicitness of his answers, and not to any call for explanation that has subsequently arisen in the misconception of the Court, and with reference to which he has appealed, he does not feel it needful to add any explanation, while he will be happy to meet any desire for explanation on the part of any of his brethren, and answer any question which such desire may prompt.

The Presbytery then proceeded to read certain passages from the Answers given in by Mr. Campbell, viz. page 22\* beginning with the words—“as to the extent of the atonement ;” and ending with the words—“without distinction :” page 114—“I hold and teach,” to page 115—“then does there lie a just charge against me :” page 116—“those likewise,” &c., to page 119—“rejecting God’s truth”—in connexion with the fifth Act of the General Assembly, held at Edinburgh in 1720—and the texts of Scripture and the declarations of the Standards of the Church referred to in the aforesaid act.

The Presbytery delay taking any farther step in the cause till their first ordinary meeting in December.

\* Pages 15 & 16, 45, 46, and 47, of the printed copy of the Answers, &c.

At Dumbarton, the seventh day of December, one thousand eight hundred and thirty.

After prayer by Dr. Graham, Moderator,

Sederunt—Messrs. Wilson, Hamilton, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, Carr, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Niven, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers; with Mr. Dunlop, Elder, from Cardross, Mr. Speirs, from Fintry, and Mr. Coll Smith, from Luss, who produced commissions from their respective Kirk Sessions.

(*Inter alia.*) The Presbytery resumed consideration of the case of Mr. Campbell of Row.

Parties being called, compeared Mr. Campbell for himself. Of the libellers, ~~there~~ appeared Messrs. Parlane M'Farlane, and Aulay Lennox; with Mr. A. M'George, jun. who produced a mandate from the libellers.

After mature deliberation; the Presbytery resolved to proceed to the probation of the libel: against which resolution, Mr. Campbell protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

The Presbytery admit to proof, such parts of the libel as were found relevant at their meeting on the twenty-second September last: grant the defender a conjunct proof of all facts and circumstances tending to exculpate or alleviate: allow him to lodge a list of witnesses to be adduced in exculpation with the Clerk of Court, on or before the last Tuesday of January, and allow the libellers a copy of such list: grant warrant to the Kirk officer of Row, who is hereby specially constituted Presbytery officer to that effect, to summon said witnesses, together with the witnesses in the list given in for the prosecutors, or such of them as they shall insist on, to compear before the Presbytery at the Bath's Inn at Helensburgh, on the third Tuesday of February, with continuation of days:—On which day the Presbytery resolve to meet at twelve o'clock, noon, to lead a proof, and take what further steps they may find just in this cause: And

the Presbytery further appoint their Moderator to write to the Moderators of neighbouring Presbyteries, requesting them to grant warrant for summoning such witnesses adduced by either party, as are not resident within the bounds of this Presbytery. Which judgment was intimated to the parties.

In the above judgment, Mr. M<sup>c</sup>George, jun. in name of the libellers acquiesced, took instruments, and craved extracts.

---

REASONS OF PROTEST and APPEAL by JOHN M<sup>c</sup>LEOD CAMPBELL, Minister of Row, against a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, come to on the seventh day of December, current, by which judgment the Presbytery resolved to proceed to a probation of the libel against the Appellant, at the instance of George M<sup>c</sup>Lellan and others, designing themselves heads of families and inhabitants of the Parish of Row.

In taking the protest for which I am now to assign reasons, it is quite manifest that I cannot have been influenced, either by the desire of protracting proceedings, or of preventing investigation, seeing that the instructions from the General Assembly, under which the Presbytery are acting, put it out of my power to prevent or even to delay any measure which appears to the Presbytery expedient.

The Assembly's instructions, whatever other effect they may have upon the history of this process, certainly save any protest that I may take in the course of it, from being liable to the complaints to which such steps on the part of the prosecuted party are usually exposed.

All I do, or can contemplate in taking such a protest, is to have the opportunity of recording my conceptions of the step which the Presbytery have adopted; and doing so, in such a shape, and at such a point, as will bring the matter under the view of the superior Courts, in the way best fitted to enable them to do ample justice in reviewing the whole case.

Of the reasons which compel me, however reluctantly, to feel dissatisfied with the judgment of my brethren, some are the same that have been already recorded as the grounds of objections to the first judgments pronounced in this process. The other additional reasons I would now respectfully state—not again recurring to the objections taken against the judgments on the relevancy, further than saying, that they must manifestly remain as objections to every subsequent step in the process, seeing that they amounted to this, that “proceeding with the trial in such darkness, and under such misconception, the appellant may eventually find himself deposed from the ministry, for teaching not only what he never held, but what he never has been libelled for holding.”

I. In the form of process, chap. vii. sec. 5, it is provided that if the Presbytery find the libel relevant, and that there is cause to insist, they are to endeavour to bring the accused party to a confession, whereby he may most glorify God. Acting upon this as the law of the Church, the meeting of Presbytery of the 5th of October last, was appointed for the purpose of holding a conference with the appellant, and of that meeting the following is the record:—

“Mr. Campbell being judicially asked if he adhered to his Answers to the libel given in against him—declared that he did adhere to the same. Being asked if he had any addition or explanation to make to these Answers—replied, that understanding this question to have reference to his personal judgment of the explicitness of his Answers, and not to any call for explanation that has subsequently arisen in the misconception of the Court, and with reference to which he has appealed, he does not feel it needful to add any explanation, while he will be happy to meet any desire for explanation on the part of any of his brethren, and answer any question which such desire may prompt.

“The Presbytery then proceeded to read certain passages from the Answers given in by Mr. Campbell, viz. page 22,

beginning with the words, ‘as to the extent of the atonement’—and ending with the words, ‘without distinction’ page 114, ‘I hold and teach,’ to page 115, ‘then does there lie a just charge against me;’ page 116, ‘These likewise,’ &c. to page 119, ‘rejecting God’s truth.’ In connexion with the Fifth Act of the General Assembly, held at Edinburgh in 1720, and the Texts of Scripture, and the declarations of the Standards of the Church referred to in the aforesaid Act.”

Now, bearing in mind the object of this conference, viz. to bring the accused party to a confession, it seems a fair representation of the *res gesta*, as recorded above, to say, that my adherence to the Answers was regarded as a confession, that the further question as to whether I had any explanations or additions to make, was put, both as giving an opportunity of qualifying my statements, which, it might be held, was due, in fairness to their accused brother, and as fixing the character of the Answers as a final confession, if no explanations were offered—that the feeling on the part of the Presbytery as to the distinctness of their own apprehension of the doctrines charged, and as to the distinctness of the avowal of the truth of the charges was such, that there was no inclination to take advantage of the invitation given to put questions, if explanations were felt needful—and that the collation of certain passages in the Answers, with passages in the Scriptures, and in the Confession of Faith, referred to in the Act of 1720, was intended to fix the character of the former as a confession of a charge which the Presbytery had already found relevant.

But whatever may be said as to the clearness with which the record can bear this commentary, it will be in the recollection of the Members of Presbytery who were present, that it is a fair statement of the feeling which actually did prevail in the Presbytery at the time. And certainly nothing but its appearing superfluous could be a reason why the Presby-

tery should not have recorded, in so many words, whether the object of their meeting had been accomplished, and whether they had brought me to a confession, or had not.

Again. In the form of process (chap. vii. sec. 7,) directions are given as to the course to be adopted in proceeding to probation, when, after the relevancy has been found, the accused party denies the fact, obviously implying that it is only when the charge is denied, and every attempt to bring to confession has proved unsuccessful, that a Presbytery is to proceed to probation. According to this principle, we must regard the resolution of the Presbytery to proceed to probation as the same thing with a declaration by the Presbytery, that, in this case, the charge made, has been denied.

This, then, is my first objection, viz. the manifest inconsistency between the proceeding of Presbytery, on the 5th October, and the judgment now appealed from. The former seeming to imply that the Presbytery held me confessed as to the charges brought against me—the latter seeming to imply that they regard me as denying these charges. These, indeed, are but inferences; but they are inferences fairly drawn; and, further, the necessity for drawing inferences arises from the absence of explicit statements on the subject—a circumstance which can admit of no right explanation, but in the clearness with which these inferences follow; for it would be manifest injustice in a Presbytery purposely so to word their minute; as to make it impossible for the accused party to know the footing on which he stands, or the estimate that is formed by his Judges of the answers to the charges brought against him, which he has lodged with them.

I therefore feel that this case would not rightly be sent to proof until the proceeding of the Presbytery on the fifth October was in some shape reversed, and until there was a distinct finding of the Presbytery that the charges made had been denied.

II. When a party accused of teaching doctrines, held to be

heretical, denies the fact of his teaching these doctrines, then, of course, a Presbytery are placed under the necessity of proceeding to probation; but it is manifest that it is regarded by the Church as much more desirable that the party should fully admit and confess what it is that he teaches, and so relieve the Presbytery from the comparatively difficult work of gathering a man's doctrines from the imperfect and partial recollections of hearers; and the two-fold risk, on the one hand, of suffering heresy to go unpunished from lack of proof, or, on the other, of causing an innocent person to suffer from the partial record of his teaching, which alone can be obtained by such means,—to bring them at once into the condition of sitting in judgment on the doctrine really taught.

Feeling the rightness of this desire on the part of the Church—feeling it, indeed, the way to enable my Presbytery to do me substantial justice, and above all, feeling that the only proper course for one called in question on the subject of doctrine, and who had not *himself*, but *the tenets which he teaches*, to defend, I did, as I was enabled, put my Presbytery in possession of a fair and full statement of my views of the subject in regard to which my orthodoxy had been called in question. And it did appear to me that my brethren would feel thankful that the case had been put into so distinct and tangible a shape, and would have felt that all that remained for them to do, was to apply these my Answers to the Standard of the Word of God, and decree righteous judgment, as God might give them the spirit of discernment. My second objection, therefore, to the resolution to proceed to probation is, that the course thus adopted, always objectionable when not rendered absolutely necessary, was in this case uncalled for. And that in turning away from the full statement laid upon their table, and in going to ascertain what may be gathered and authenticated of my teaching from the partial and inaccurate recollections of my hearers, my brethren are unnecessarily exposing themselves to the risk of



being led away from the true merits of the case—of making me an offender for a word—and, as regards the truth of God, of sitting in judgment on half-remembered expressions, instead of being found weighing the broad and full statement of the doctrines held.

III. In Chap. vii. sec. 8. Form of process, the following provision is made for dealing with ministers to whom a charge of heresy has actually been brought home,—“ if the errors be not gross, and striking at the vitals of religion, or if they be not pertinaciously stuck unto, or industriously spread, with a visible design to corrupt, or that the errors are not spreading among the people, then lenitives, admonitions, instructions, and frequent conferences are to be tried to reclaim without cutting off.” From this passage it appears that it is not so much the fact of past acts of heretical teaching, as the present state of the views and teaching of the person against whom such past acts may have been proved, that is to be considered. It is never the principle of the Church to put errors of this kind on a footing with scandalous sins, but rather to consider whether there is prospective danger in suffering the individual to occupy the place of a Teacher; therefore does she take no advantage of statements made in time past, in the way of holding a man committed, but simply seeks to be assured of the orthodoxy of a man’s present faith, and of what would be the character of his teaching, if now permitted to teach.

This principle, by which the Church’s conduct towards her ministers, subsequent to the proof of heresy against them, is regulated, I now refer to, as justifying the importance I have held to be due to my own statement of my views, and I would rest upon it this third Objection to the judgment appealed from, viz. that if subsequent to the unfavourable issue of a trial, an error not pertinaciously adhered to could not be made the ground of cutting me off, there is no occasion to inquire, or go about to prove whether I have ever

taught any thing beyond the statements contained in my answers. If I have never held nor set forth any thing on the subject to which they refer, beyond what they state, then they must be admitted to contain the whole case. On the other hand, supposing that any thing had been held not admitted in them, then such other matter should be made no account of, seeing that not only is it not pertinaciously adhered to, but is not now held at all.

I desire not to be understood as in the most distant way admitting that I have either held or taught any such matter, beyond the statement I have submitted to my brethren. If indeed such had been the fact of my past teaching, and that I had once held what I had subsequently seen cause to give up, I would have felt the free and full admission of my error to be my present duty to the Church of Christ. To such a duty, however, I have not, as yet, found myself called: but I suppose the case that I had held or taught any thing beyond the statements in the Answers, because though I myself know, my brethren are not called upon to take for granted that such has not been the case, and because, therefore, in objecting to their resolution to proceed to probation on the ground which I am now taking, it is incumbent on me to shew that the ends of justice do not render it imperative upon them to inquire what the fact in this respect is, for that it is quite enough to enable them to judge whether the people under my charge, and the Church of which I am a member, are entitled to expect from them that they should take any step to interrupt my ministrations,—that it is quite enough, I say, to enable them to judge of this, that they should know what, at this moment, I hold and teach.

IV. It is in the knowledge of my brethren, that some members of Presbytery, on hearing the Answers read, declared that they went farther to condemn me, than even the statements charged in the libel, supposing them proved; and that the same individuals have since stated, that, on reading

and reconsidering these answers, they have departed from this opinion. Now, this fact has furnished the Presbytery in general, and these individuals more particularly, with a striking practical illustration of the injustice to which a person may be exposed, by having his sentiments judged of from the impressions carried away by the hearers of spoken discourses. And the Fourth consideration which I present, as appearing to me a reason why the Presbytery should not have resolved to proceed to probation, is, that if any thing in the form of expression, ascribed to me in the various statements in the minor proposition of the libel, should appear to my brethren more objectionable than the statements contained in my Answers, this might have been regarded as having a satisfactory explanation in the imperfect character of that record of spoken discourses which the recollections of hearers furnish.

If persons sitting in a judicial capacity, listening, with the feeling of the responsibility of such a situation, to the reading of written defences, could take up so decidedly, and so strongly, unfavourable impressions, which on reading these same Answers again were changed, much more might it have been the case, that words might be quoted, yea honestly sworn to, from which no true estimate of the thing taught could be formed.

Lastly, It may not be improper to notice now, in conclusion, the *single ground* for proceeding to lead a proof which was mentioned in the inferior Court. It was asked, "Why say that there was no occasion to take proof, when certain statements in the minor proposition of the libel were distinctly denied?"

Acting upon the principle of fairly stating facts to the extent of my knowledge, I have said of those statements which I did not recognise, that I did not recognise them;—of those again which I knew I could not have used, that I have not used them. I so refer to these statements, not

because they went to prove something which I did not admit to be true, but just because these were the facts concerning them. And some of the statements which I have refused to recognise as mine, are not so much statements of error, as they are absolute nonsense: and others of them, although they had been used, could not be regarded as amounting to any thing more than an inaccurate and awkward expression of doctrines, which I admitted myself to teach.

But in reply to the above argument for proceeding to probation, founded on the notice which I have taken of the statements of the minor proposition, I would simply observe, that the question—the great question, in regard to which the Presbytery are seeking a sure answer—is not whether certain words in the minor proposition have been uttered, but whether certain doctrines denounced, in the major, as heretical, have been taught. When the line of defence adopted is, that the doctrines charged, admitting them to be taught, are not heretical, and objection is thus taken against the relevancy of the libel, then it becomes of no importance to inquire, whether the particular statements in the minor proposition are true or false, seeing that, supposing them to be all true, they can never be used as the proof of any charge beyond what is contained in the major to which they refer.

The occupation of time and attention on my own part, involved in conducting my defence, according to the course resolved upon by the Presbytery—my consequent abstraction, for the time, from the ordinary duties of my ministry—the occupation of the minds of my whole parish with the details of the trial—along with the evil influence in many ways likely to arise from the collisions of individuals, appearing for the prosecution and for the defence—collisions from which the most perfect integrity and honesty of purpose are no certain protection—are considerations, which, though I do not found upon them here, do still add much to my regret that my attempt to save my Presbytery, my parish, and

myself, from the evils connected with the probation of the libel, by the full statement with which I furnished my brethren, have proved unsuccessful.

In respect whereof, &c.

(Signed) JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL,  
Minister of Row.

*Kilninver, 15th December, 1830.*

---

REASONS of DISSENT and COMPLAINT by the REV. ROBERT STORY, from a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, at their Meeting held in Dumbarton, on the 21st of September, to the next Meeting of Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, anent the relevancy of the major proposition in the libel presented against the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, by certain parishioners of Row.

1st, I might object to the libel generally, as containing vague and indefinite charges, clothed in words susceptible of various meanings, without specifying in what sense Mr. Campbell employed them when illustrating what he conceived to be the truth of God. Upon the principle laid down in the form of process, that since the credit and success of the gospel much depends on the entire credit and reputation of Ministers, their sound doctrine and holy conversation, no stain thereof ought to be lightly received, nor when it comes before a judicature ought it to be negligently inquired into. I hold, that unless it had contained more precise charges, it ought not to have been entertained by the Reverend Presbytery. Had the remit of the venerable Assembly, by any possible construction of the powers which it confers upon the Presbytery, released them from their duties or responsibility, as the radical Court of Justiciary, I might have acquiesced in the judgment of my brethren.

The General Assembly, however, concluding, from an *ex parte* statement before them, (of which Mr. Campbell had no power in their presence to give any explanation,) enjoined the Reverend Presbytery to receive a libel from the complainers. In its very terms the remit implies that the Presbytery had ascertained, or would ascertain, that doctrines imputed to Mr. Campbell were the identical doctrines condemned by Act 1720; and I dissent from the judgment of the Reverend Presbytery, because, from the libel which they have found relevant, they could not so conclude by any unavoidable or necessary consequence. For although it should be found that the same words have been used by Mr. Campbell, as are employed to clothe the doctrine which that Assembly condemned, it does not follow that they denoted the same conceptions of truth. Solitary sentences, or passages, severed from their connexion, might be selected from the infallible word itself, which would seem in utter discordance with the truth which that word was intended to convey; and upon the same principle the standards of our Church might be easily proved a mere collection of heretical notions. A man must not be condemned, much less a minister of the gospel, for a word. In the mere words of every teacher, from the apostolical times until now, might be detected some damnable error; more especially all the Protestant Fathers might have been served with libels concluding for the last penalties. Luther, beyond all controversy, might have been consigned to the flames by a jury of his brother Reformers; and Calvin himself, the most exact of Theologians, might have shared the doom of Servetus.

Were it eventually found that the words imputed to Mr. Campbell in the libel, imply what the Presbytery suppose, this dissent from their judgment, it might seem expedient to withdraw; but as yet, not being able to see that they are necessarily significant of the doctrines which the Act 1720 condemned, I cannot but complain that the production of a

libel more accurate and precise in its allegations was not enjoined upon Mr. Campbell's accusers.

2d, But more particularly, I object to the major proposition of the libel, in respect of its not containing specifically libellous matter. For that alone I hold to be libellous in doctrine, which is contradictory of any declaration in the Holy Scriptures or our Standards. Were any other principle admitted such a latitude would be afforded to rash and malignant accusers, as must of necessity jeopard the reputation and usefulness of every minister of the Church of Scotland. Trials for constructive treason would not be more fatal to civil freedom, from the jealousy and suspicion of tyrannical power, than trials for inferential heresy to honest and bold teaching of truth, in seasons of ecclesiastical excitement or intrigue. Thus I express myself to guard and illustrate what I say, when I dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery anent the relevancy of the major proposition, because it does not, according to the meaning of the terms employed, necessarily contain libellous matter.

The words "Universal Atonement" and "Universal Pardon," "Assurance is of the essence of faith"—the libellers may have heard Mr. Campbell pronounce, but in what sense they do not aver, which indeed could have been known to the Reverend Presbytery only by their having specifically declared to what Scriptural truths, or Protestant doctrines, they were opposite.

3d, While I dissent and complain for the reasons already assigned, I do so further because in a certain sense the words imputed to Mr. Campbell, by the libellers, express most true doctrines, contrary neither to the Scriptures nor the Standards of our Church.

1st, With regard to universal atonement and pardon through Jesus Christ, I must premise, as they are not words of Scripture, they are not to be adopted without very special explanation. To the use of words not in Scripture I have

ever had, and now more than ever, strong objections; holding as I do, that since, on the highest authority, "the words of God are pure words, as silver tried," they are the best possible for expressing the truths which he has chosen to reveal;—nay further, esteeming as errors, not differing in kind, if even in degree of guilt, the coining of new expressions to describe more accurately the ancient truths of God, and the profane use of God's own words to clothe the novelties of human invention.

1st, But while I so express myself, and without any sanction of its use, there is a sense of universal atonement—not contrary to Scripture declarations, nor inconsistent with the Standards of our Church. It is not contrary to Scripture declarations. There are many expressions indeed in the Old and New Testament, which, without violent or unnatural construction, imply the existence of a certain relationship between Christ and all human beings, which could not be unless all, in some way or other, were affected by His incarnation, by His life, and by His death. The head of their common enemy, according to the first promise, he was ordained to bruise; in the seed of Abraham, his ancestor, according to the flesh, God himself declared all the families of the earth should be blessed—he is described as the desire of all nations, as the bearer of the iniquities of all—as the taker away of the sin of the world—as tasting death for every man. All which expressions, and many others equally emphatic, might be selected, are decisive of a wider connexion between Christ and man than could be explained by the relationship that exists between him and the chosen people of God,—unless other declarations were found by which their import could be countervailed or neutralized, they imply that something has been affected by the Saviour's dying in the common nature of man, in which men have a common interest. There is, however, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament any such expression. He is described,



indeed, as laying down his life for the sheep ; but it is a bold conclusion that no other, therefore, are interested in his death. As well might it seem, that because he took away the sin of the world, sin still remains on each individual soul. He saves only his people from their sins ; but can it follow, by any just consequence, that the guilt of those who reject him and die in their sins is not aggravated because he died ?

2d, Besides, the typical institutions devised to show forth to the ancient church the character of the Saviour's agency and his gospel corroborate the explicit declarations alluded to : *this*, not to multiply examples, the lifting up of the serpent attested the possibility of cure to all who were diseased, while the atonement made every year for all the sins of all the people, was significant of the blessed truth, although sin existed communion was possible between God and man.

3d, But further, while it contradicts no divine testimony and harmonizes with gospel truth revealed in typical institutions, it is assumed throughout the whole Bible, and at every point is elucidated and confirmed by the analogy of faith. The etymology of the Saxon word atonement, adopted in our translation, for which reconciliation is sometimes synonymously used, implies the removal of an obstruction which prevented the contact, agreement, or communion of objects or agents. In this sense, atonement, as synonymous with the effect of the death of Christ, expresses the radical truth, so to speak, without which the continuance of life to man, or any communions of God with any man, would have been impossible, or be now an inexplicable mystery. Adam forfeited his life by his sin. Irrespective of God's secret counsel, or of his ultimate design in the creation of man, the legislative declaration, In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, conclusively attested to Adam and to all, the righteous, and by God's ordinance, the inevitable desert of sin—death ; the extinction of life, by which in any or all of its senses, is implied utter impossibility of holding com-

munion with God. The fact, then, of Adam being visited not in judgment but in mercy by his Maker, revealing in promise to him, although guilty and deserving death, the bearer of iniquities and the destroyer of death, proved that, notwithstanding his sinfulness, Adam, and the human race in Adam, were placed in circumstances where that communion had not ceased to be possible. The whole of Scripture, the analogy of all the truths which scripture contains, obviously connect those circumstances and the possibility of that communion with the work of the Messiah—the bruising of the serpent's head—the atonement, and this irrespective of those ultimate distinctions which God in his eternal counsels had decreed to establish among the children of men. Those circumstances—this possibility—this reconciliation—this atonement, so different from the fixed irremediable death that had been incurred, obviously, according to the Scriptures, affects all men, and that in virtue of Christ's agency. In this sense, therefore, using atonement, it seems undeniable that the term universal atonement is expressive of a truth clearly revealed in the Bible, without which the race of men would have perished in the person of the first sinner, or their successive generations would have judicially been excluded without any exception whatever, from the possibility of any intercourse with their offended Creator. Now, as it appears, that in this sense, the work of the Saviour in its consequences, is not limited to those, merely, who believe in his name, but extends to all, in as much as existence could not have been enjoyed by the most godless scotner of the blood of Jesus, had not that blood been shed—even Cain the first murderer would never have been, but for the death of him who was the object of his brother's faith and hope; and he perished in his sins, not because he was doomed by inevitable and fatal necessity to that which was evil, but because, when he had shed innocent blood, he looked not to the sin-offering lying at his door, and his existence was a permanent

misery from the conviction, that his punishment was greater than he could bear ; while he denied that there was forgiveness with him by whose mercy the life of his father had been saved, and in whose promises to the guilty the soul of his believing brother had found repose.

While the very existence of the race of man and of every individual of that race, in a condition intermediate between contracted guilt and its deserved infliction, of necessity implies the all-comprehensive virtue of the atonement, as already explained ; so all the manifestations of God's character in the Scriptures, unite in setting forth, in illustration of the truth, that men are now, and have been ever since the fall, under a dispensation, where, at the very least, it may be averred judgment is suspended, not inflicted. For otherwise, there could be no other conclusion, than that the estate of the reprobate differed in the degree, not in the kind of its misery, while on this side the grave, and in the endurance of the second death beyond it.

2d, But the reasons why I dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery, in respect of the relevancy of the term universal atonement, will appear further from what I proceed to state concerning the term universal pardon. The term itself, I have no hesitation in unreservedly and unequivocally condemning, as fitted to mislead, as not framed to give right conceptions of the truth, either in the Scriptures or the Standards. But the truth must not suffer although arrayed in an unseemly garment, as if thereby, of necessity, it were transformed into error ; for there is a sense in which all men are pardoned through Jesus Christ. They are now in a state of probation, or under a dispensation of grace, as is most clearly revealed throughout the whole of Scripture. These express the same fact or truth, and I use them as convertible terms. The continuance of being, and the possibility of communion with God, resulting from the atonement, might, or might not, have been a blessing : but the term universal

pardon implies also, that man's life was not continued to him as a curse, and that he might enjoy communion with his Maker if he willed it. If it were otherwise, the Scriptures would teach that man is necessarily, and without remedy, subjected during the whole of his being to the judicial results of the original sin ; that his continuance in sin is not because he himself will have it so—that he is in the very condition in which he would have been had Christ not died—that he is condemned now, and will be hereafter, simply because he is a child of Adam, and not as the wilful rejecter of God's grace in his crucified Son—that he is the inheritor of death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, because, in a remote age, in the first beginning of time, his ancestor violated a law meriting that judgment ; and not that he himself has devoted the energies of his perverse and depraved mind to the perpetration of two great evils, hewing out to himself broken cisterns, and the forsaking of God, the all-sufficient good, the fountain of living waters.

Now, no truth is more clearly revealed in Scripture, than that God does not hate any of the sons of men, in the common acceptation of the term. Hatred of any object is inseparably connected in our conceptions with a desire of inflicting upon it pain—to ATTRIBUTE such a sentiment to GOD is BLASPHEMY, and cannot possibly be found among the delineations of the divine character in the records of truth. He swears by himself, by his own life, on the contrary, that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked. The innumerable counsels, expostulations, entreaties, promises, threatenings, the Bible contains, all express the same solemn and awful reality, which imposes upon each human sinner so peremptory an obligation to return to his God and give him glory. In so expressing myself I mean to affirm, that all men, within and beyond the pale of special revelation, are utterly inexcusable in not giving glory to God ; and that at all times, and every where, according to the Scriptures, he has, in virtue

of the atonement, manifested such long suffering and goodness, as are fitted to lead all to repentance—every man, from the beginning, being placed in circumstances, sufficiently decisive of God's desire of his true happiness, to warrant his final condemnation, even although Adam and his intermediate ancestors had never sinned.

So explained, it will be seen how the present condition of the wicked being different from the future, depends upon the alleged heretical notion of universal pardon.—Why they are not now in a condition of fixed and irrevocable judgment—why there is not yet such a gulf between them and the righteous, as between Dives and Lazarus in the parable—why its insertion is delayed without compromise of his inflexible justice—that the present condition and final doom of the ungodly might unite to unfold the character of him thus described in the Psalms, “thou wast a God that forgavest them, but tookest vengeance on their inventions.”

Finally, As it thus appears, unless, in a certain sense, the work of Christ be regarded as so extensive, there could be no specific difference between a human sinner and a condemned spirit, every where in Scripture represented as in very unlike conditions; as the very idea of a dispensation of grace, of which the Bible itself is a symbol or a monument, must be rejected, and the preaching of the gospel, which it bears to any but the elect, as a solemn mockery, if not a profane and presumptuous intermeddling with the purposes of God—I trust my brethren will do me the justice of saying, that while I so think and feel, I could not but dissent from their finding anent the relevancy of the first accusation in the major proposition of the libel.

3d, But further, I dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery, in respect of the utter indefiniteness of the second charge, namely, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, so obviously susceptible of different meanings, which itself is decisive of its irrelevancy; but more

especially, because its most obvious meaning is contradictory of no Scripture declaration. The Scriptures indeed give no declaration on the subject. If assurance, being of the essence of faith, imply any thing else, than that a mental persuasion or assuredness is identical with believing—wherever the word is used, or the idea expressed in Scripture, of necessity this assuredness or persuasion is implied, for in the Scriptures, devised to be profitable to all men, words are used with their common meaning, to express truths of common importance. In all ages, and in all languages, belief implies persuasion, so that they may be regarded as convertible terms,—of this there can be no question, as it is well expressed by a learned and profound divine of the present day, and a father of this Presbytery—"The assurance of faith," says the Rev. Dr. Hamilton, in one of his able publications, "or a clear and full conviction of the reality of the thing believed, is absolutely essential to the nature of faith. In fact, this *assurance and faith are one and the same thing*, and none who understands the meaning of the language, will ever hesitate for a moment to admit, that it is absolutely necessary to the existence of religion in the heart. *Faith, and the assurance of faith, are only two names for the same thing.*" Assuming, then, this definition of the assurance of faith to be just and true, viz. *that assurance of faith is faith*, the libellers must be held as attributing to Mr. Campbell, as a heretical notion, that faith is necessary to salvation. Is it needful to say any thing more, why I object to the relevancy of the second charge in the major, inasmuch as it contradicts no scriptural declaration, for might not the words, "without faith it is impossible to please God," quoted by any minister of the gospel, as well be incorporated in a libel, concluding for the last penalties?

4th, But I dissent further, in respect of the charges in question being in nothing contrary to the truth of the matter contained in our Standard.

While I hold that the doctrines of the Standards are truths of God, only because they are found in the Scriptures ; and that the Scriptures are not to be regarded as teaching certain doctrines, merely because they are found in the Standards ; it is readily admitted, that were the Standards to contain any declaration which the alleged heresies oppose, irrespective of the Scriptures, for the purposes of good order and discipline, they must be held judicially relevant to infer the conclusions of the libel. But in regard—

1st, To universal atonement in the sense already explained, I can discover nothing contradictory of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of this Church, approved by the General Assembly, and ratified by law. For this is evident—negatively and positively, from what they do not and what they do declare.

1st, They do not declare that in no way whatever all men are affected by the death of Christ. They do not declare that the sentence was suspended in virtue of any other agency than that which was revealed in the first promise. They do not declare that men would have existed in their present condition of trial irrespective of the shedding of the blood of Christ—that the wicked or unbelieving are already in the very condition in which they are doomed to exist eternally—that men do not aggravate their guilt every moment by rejecting God's counsels against themselves, by refusing to acknowledge, in God's long suffering and kindness, what is naturally fitted to lead to repentance and salvation—that the reprobation of these who are not elected unto life, is, without any respect to their own sin, or that, by eternal and infallible decree, God is, in the same sense, the author of man's damnation as he is of man's salvation—finally, they do not declare that while here the reprobate are so doomed to unbelief, or urged to strong delusions by such necessity as would justify them in not believing in Jesus as their Saviour, or rejecting the eternal truths of God.

All which they could not avoid declaring, if they taught that in no way whatever all men were affected by the death of Christ.

2d. But, from what they do declare regarding it, it is most clear, that they contain nothing incompatible with the doctrine in question. They affirm most clearly and definitely, that "those of mankind who are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal purpose and secret counsel, and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his spirit-working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power, through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

Now such declarations as these, in their matter, are most true founded on the infallible oracles of God. For throughout the whole of the Confession the word Redeemed, or the idea of redemption, is never introduced without reference to the work of the Spirit in those who shall finally be saved.

If, by universal atonement in the major of the libel were meant, that all were redeemed in this sense, *or that all were equally in possession of something which Christ did to purchase, whether they believed in his name or not*, I would have no hesitation whatever, instead of dissenting from the judgment of my brethren, in pronouncing it a pernicious error—an Antinomian delusion, and striking at the very vitals of



religion. But universal atonement cannot for a moment be regarded as synonymous with universal redemption. The atonement, in the sense I have explained, having, according to the Scriptures, rendered possible communion between God and sinful Adam, while it is the very tenor by which his posterity exist in their present condition.

That the atonement, as thus affecting all, is distinct from, while not inconsistent with, the doctrine of the Standards regarding particular redemption, must be apparent from the answer to the question, "How are we made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ? By the effectual application of it to us by his Holy Spirit."

That the possibility of the communion alluded to, or the tenor by which we hold existence, cannot be convertible with redemption, is obvious from the way it is applied by the Spirit to the soul, namely, by working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual calling.

The fact that God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of his will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath *for their sin*, "to the praise of his glorious justice," affects not the truth that universal atonement accords with particular redemption, meaning by this the manifestation of that work of God in Christ existing only in those who believe. For the Standards most wisely say, *that for their sin* they were ordained to dishonour and wrath, while, with consummate discretion and wisdom, they avoid expressions more particular; although beyond all controversy they cannot be held as affirming that the sin for which they are ordained to dishonour and wrath is utterly irrespective of what Christ has done for the world, or of the condition in which the shedding of his blood had placed all the generations of men.

2d, With respect to universal pardon as it has been ex-

plained, I cannot but hold that it is compatible with the doctrines of the Standards and negatives none of their declarations. Were all enjoying pardon, in the sense the word is used in those standards, no reason could have existed for any other but a unanimous judgment of Presbytery in this matter; but while I hold, that the Standards are founded upon the infallible word, I do not thereby admit that the words employed in them are words of God, or that they are at all times the best possible for clothing his truths. In these Standards, it is taught, that pardon is bestowed upon the redeemed, not for any thing wrought in them or by them, but for Christ's sake alone—not, of consequence, for the sake of their repentance, yet it is also taught that repentance is of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it. The pardon of the Standards expresses that which cannot be enjoyed by an impenitent mind. Of necessity, therefore, even in this life, universal pardon can have no existence so long as one prodigal of the human family has not returned to his Heavenly Father. But in so limiting the meaning of pardon, the Standards of this church can never be held as excluding the idea of its universality, in the sense in which I have defined it—namely that something is done to and enjoyed by all men, in consequence of the dying of the Lord Jesus. The possibility of communion with God might have been unaccompanied with any desire for that communion on the part of God. The prolongation of life might have been without enjoyment; but the fact, that the tender mercies and loving kindnesses of God, are over all men, and that all are under a dispensation of grace, the Standards nowhere deny. They do not therefore limit to the redeemed what the Saviour hath purchased by his blood. On the contrary, there are express declarations of the Standards in which they teach, that the work of Christ extends beyond the redeemed in the procuring and bestowal of blessing. All gifts, ordinary and extraordinary, of the Holy Spirit, Christ

has received from his Father for the benefit of man ; nor will it be denied, that wherever the Spirit affects any soul, it is in virtue of the work of Christ ; while it is equally clear, that whether ordinary or extraordinary, every gift or influence bestowed is in itself a blessing. " For whom did the Saviour procure the Holy Spirit ? for the redeemed only ? " The Standards assert the contrary, and say, " that others not elected or redeemed, may have some common operations of the Spirit. "

The conclusion is unavoidable, that unless the Standards held that the Holy Spirit would have strove with man's rebellious mind although Christ had not died, they thus unequivocally teach, that others than the redeemed are under a dispensation of grace—that others than the redeemed are the recipients of divine influences—influences purchased by his blood, and thus teaching that universal pardon, as it has been defined, is truly accordant with particular redemption. Now, unless these common operations of the Spirit are curses and not blessings, and that all the mercies, others than the redeemed enjoy, are expressive of hatred and not of love—of cruelty, and not of kindness in God—unless the grief so often expressed, that men should fail to turn to him their hearts, be, but as a mere rhetorical device, and not an awful reality ; the Standards in so expressing the truth, coincide with the Scriptures in representing the crucified and risen Saviour as the channel of blessing, of spiritual blessing, over a wider field than the sanctuary of His elect children.

In all this, so natural for us to believe, I see clearly the doctrine of the major in the sense I have explained it—undeniably true, as it may be, in the estimation of all who have seen Jesus weeping over Jerusalem, or heard him say, " he that hath seen me hath seen the Father. " Regarding it, therefore, as most clearly admitted in the Standards, that the reprobate enjoy blessings conveyed to them through Jesus, which were impossible for them to have enjoyed, had not they been interested in the shedding of his blood, or been born under a

dispensation of grace or pardon—I cannot conclude with my brethren in the terms of their judgment, regarding the universal atonement and pardon of the libel.

3d, In respect of the second charge, I also dissent from that judgment, as nowhere do the Standards deny, that faith is necessary to salvation; a *proposition* with which, after what has been stated concerning it, *that* in the libel I am entitled to regard as identical, and, beyond controversy, not relevant to infer its conclusions.

Had the doctrine that assurance of personal salvation is of the essence of faith, been imputed to Mr. Campbell, the accusation would have been of a different complexion, as it might have seemed to justify the finding of the Presbytery, in so far as it may be held opposite to the chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith. As that, however, is not charged, but only that an assured faith is necessary to salvation, in which there is a perception of Christ's relationship to the man so believing, I must dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery regarding its relevancy, so long as I hold *that* to be a true definition of faith in our Shorter Catechism, according as it does with the use of the term in Scripture, namely, *that* whereby we receive and rest upon Jesus Christ alone for salvation, as he is offered in the gospel.

For these and various other reasons that might be assigned, and which I shall crave liberty at their bar to express, I complain and dissent from the judgment of Reverend Presbytery, to the Very Reverend the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, at their meeting, to be held at Irvine 12th of October, 1830.

(Signed) R. STORY.

Dumbarton, October 1st, 1830.

What is contained on this and the preceding thirty-eight pages, is a true copy of Reasons of Dissent and Complaint of the Rev. Robert Story, against a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, of date the 21st September, 1830.

WILLIAM JAFFRAY, *Pby. Clerk.*



## PROOF FOR THE PROSECUTION

IN THE CASE OF

JOHN MACLEOD CAMPBELL,

MINISTER OF ROW.

---

THE REV. PATRICK BREWSTER, one of the Ministers of the A Abbey Parish of Paisley, aged about forty-three, married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel, depones, that he is one of the ministers of the Abbey Parish of Paisley: Depones, that he has been about twelve years an ordained minister of the Church of B Scotland: Depones, that he knows the defender: Depones, that he heard the defender preach at Row on the occasion of the presbyterial visitation in July, 1830: Depones, that he made written notes of the sermon at the time: Depones; that the defender's discourse was a lecture upon the first C twelve verses of the fifth chapter of Matthew: Depones, that, upon the pardon of sin, Mr. Campbell said, that that man alone can obtain mercy, or can be saved, "who knows that God has had mercy upon him, and has forgiven him;" the words just quoted being Mr. Campbell's own words, and the D previous words the import or substance of what Mr. Campbell said: Depones, that on the same occasion the defender said, that those alone bore the character of peacemakers, "who knew that Christ died for every human being," the words last quoted being Mr. Campbell's own words. Interrogated E for the defender, Depones, that the words in the expression last referred to previous to the words "who knew" express no more than the import of Mr. Campbell's expression: Depones, that, on the occasion above alluded to, Mr. Campbell

- A followed up his statement as to the extent of the atonement, by calling upon all men to repent toward God, and it is possible that he added a call to be reconciled to God : That the deponent understood these calls to be addressed to those of Mr. Campbell's hearers whose characters were not such as
- B he had previously described in illustrating the text : Depones, that the deponent cannot say, from the badness of his memory, whether Mr. Campbell urged the future judgment, and the consequence of unbelief, as reasons for repenting towards God. Interrogated for the pursuers, Whether, during the
- C twelve months between September 1829 and 1830, he has had any conversation with the defender regarding the doctrines of universal atonement and pardon, or the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation ? To which it was objected for the defender, that no one of
- D the ten charges contained in the minor proposition of the libel related to a private conversation,—that the Presbytery had not found any part of the minor relevant, but matter contained in one or other of these ten charges,—that, in point of fact, the presbytery had remitted to proof nothing
- E but such portions of these ten charges as had been found relevant by them,—and therefore, that no specification in the minor proposition lying beyond these limits could competently be investigated or proved,—even supposing that such specification were not (as it really is) quite irrelevantly laid.\*
- F To which it was answered for the libellers, The charge against Mr. Campbell is contained in the words which follow the major proposition, beginning, “ Yet true it is and of verity,” &c. to the end of that paragraph. It is there charged that Mr. Campbell promulgated the objectionable doctrines
- G on various occasions *during twelve months*, from the pulpit, *in conversation*, in addresses to communicants, and in minis-

\* N. B. This objection afterwards held as repeated on several occasions, *mutatis mutandis*, when evidence on other points similarly situated was offered by the libellers.

terial visitations. The ten particular instances are merely A given as examples of this; but the libellers are entitled to prove *any* thing said by Mr. Campbell *during the twelve months libelled*, in the manner above set forth, which tends to show that he holds, and has expressed the doctrines in question. Whereupon the Presbytery found the question B competent. Against which the defender protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be given in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts. Mr. Story dissented from the finding of the court, and protested for leave to complain, for reasons afterwards to be given in, took instruments, and craved C extracts.

And the question being put, depones, that he had a conversation with the defender in Glasgow in October, 1829, after a meeting of the Clerical Society, where an Essay had been read D by the deponent on the subject of Assurance of Faith as connected with Assurance of Salvation. And at this conversation the defender maintained the doctrine of assurance of salvation. Interrogated for the defender—depones, that Mr. Campbell, in maintaining the doctrine of assurance of salvation, merely E stated, that the expressions used by him in the society above mentioned were correct: That the conversation between the deponent and Mr. Campbell regarding the assurance of salvation led to a conversation regarding the assurance of faith: Depones, that the assurance of faith was defined by Mr. F Campbell to be, as the deponent understood it, an assurance of the truth of the record—as undoubted an assurance as one human being could have of the presence of another human being. Re-interrogated for the libellers, Whether the deponent can state from recollection the substance of the speech G which Mr. Campbell delivered in the Clerical Society on the above occasion? Whereupon the objection formerly made for the defender was repeated; and the question being found competent, the defender protested for leave to appeal to the



A Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be given in in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

And the question being put, Depones, that in the said speech, Mr. Campbell referred to the arguments used by the essay writer, and assented to the conclusion which he, the essay writer, had drawn from them, which was the assurance of salvation : That he then proceeded to rebut the arguments which the essay writer had produced against assurance of salvation as a primary act of faith. Re-interrogated for the defender, Depones, that the conclusion to the essay, with which Mr. Campbell agreed, was, that assurance of salvation was inseparably connected with assurance of faith : Depones, that in rebutting the arguments in the essay to which he objected, Mr. Campbell stated that every christian must have assurance of faith ; and also, that it was necessary to peace of mind to be absolutely certain regarding the truth of the record, or that the record was a revelation from God ; Mr. Campbell holding, that any degree of uncertainty regarding the truth of the record was inconsistent with the peace of mind of a christian : And that the assurance of faith had for its object the truth of the record, as contradistinguished from the assurance of salvation ; and, at the same time, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that this assurance of faith implied in it assurance of salvation, and that this assurance of salvation was of the essence of assurance of faith : Depones, that the point of agreement between the essayist and Mr. Campbell was, that assurance of salvation was inseparably connected, as an inference, with the assurance of faith : That in regard to the point of difference, the opinion expressed by the essayist was, that assurance of faith being the result of the external evidence for the record, in conjunction with the evidence derivable from the effects of faith on the heart of the believer, the assurance of salvation could not be obtained as a primary act of faith : That the opinion expressed by Mr. Campbell was, that assurance of salvation was of the

essence of assurance of faith, and was obtained in the same A  
act of belief: That the deponent cannot recollect all the  
arguments employed by Mr. Campbell to shew that it was  
so, but that on which he chiefly dwelt was, that it was essen-  
tial to our complete peace of mind, to be assured that the  
evidence for the record amounted to absolute certainty. B

By the desire of the witness it was here added, that, with  
the exception of those parts of the defender's sermon to which  
he has given evidence, his attention was not exclusively  
directed to the sermon preached by the defender before the  
Presbytery. Interrogated by Mr. Story, Whether the depo- C  
nent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that this assurance of  
personal salvation, spoken of as an inference from the assur-  
ance of faith, was capable of increase: Depones, that he  
cannot be sure that Mr. Campbell said so in so many words,  
and rather thinks he did not. And all this is truth, as the D  
deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) · P. BREWSTER.

PETER M'LEOD, clothier in Helensburgh, aged about  
twenty-two, and unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined E  
and purged of malice and partial counsel, depones, that from  
September 1829 to September 1830 he generally attended  
the church of Row: Depones, that he took notes of some of  
Mr. Campbell's sermons, but did not preserve them: De-  
pones, that Mr. Campbell frequently stated in his sermons, F  
that Christ died for all men—for the sins of all men; that  
he literally tasted death for every man: Depones, that Mr.  
Campbell said, that in consequence of Christ's dying for the  
sins of all men, their sins were forgiven: Depones, that Mr.  
Campbell stated, that the belief of God's so loving every man G  
as to give Christ to die for every man, and consequently that  
his forgiving love pardoned all men through the death of  
Christ, and now that Christ had the Spirit for them to enable  
them to hold communion with God; the belief of which

**A** introduces the mind to know the character of God, the knowledge of which is eternal life; that these were the things which Mr. Campbell said were essential for a sinner's enjoying eternal life: Depones, that Mr. Campbell said, that unless a person believed this, he did not know God, and must **B** remain in his unsanctified state; and further, that he would be judged according to the circumstances in which he was placed by the death of Christ, and be condemned or justified according to the use which he made of these circumstances or privileges: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that except a man believed these things as applicable to himself, and for himself, he could not enjoy eternal life: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that assurance stands or falls with faith: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that when a man is **D** fully and freely believing the whole gospel, it is impossible for him not to have at that time an assurance of his own salvation: Depones, that these doctrines were generally maintained by Mr. Campbell, and either formed the subject of his discourse, or he exhorted from them at the conclusion of **E** his sermon, when it was an another subject.

Interrogated for the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has often stated, that there was life for every man in Christ: Depones, that he does not recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell state, that every man had life given him by **F** Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated it as the object of God's forgiving love, to draw men to himself: Depones, that he stated the consequences of not coming to God: Depones, that the consequence in this life was, that they would remain unsanctified: Depones, that the consequence in another life was eternal condemnation. Being interrogated, If he recollects any particular illustration being given by Mr. Campbell of the doctrine, that all men may now come to God through Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that the ground on which they might, was, that God had given

Christ for every man : Depones, that Mr. Campbell illus- A  
 trated the statement by saying, that he was commissioned to  
 preach the gospel, according to Christ's declaration, to every  
 man, and how could he do so, unless he could say that Christ  
 had died for every man—for that was the gospel—but that  
 God had so loved him as to give Christ to die for him : De- B  
 pones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that the way in which the  
 privileges of all men, in consequence of the death of Christ,  
 would prove their condemnation, if they did not believe on  
 his name, was their rejection of Christ : Depones, that at the  
 day of judgment men would, according to Mr. Campbell's C  
 teaching, be judged for their evil deeds : Depones, that Mr.  
 Campbell stated, that the want of assurance of salvation at  
 any time proceeded from unbelief of the gospel : Depones,  
 that in his saying, that unbelief was the cause of the want of  
 assurance of salvation, he implied, that it was possible for a D  
 believer to be at times without the assurance of salvation :  
 Depones, that Mr. Campbell never held out peace or security  
 to the careless or impenitent while they remained so : De-  
 pones, that he employed the terrors of the wrath to come to  
 awaken such persons : Depones, that he made their being E  
 warned of God's forgiveness an aggravation of that wrath :  
 Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in his sermons, did, generally  
 speaking, most distinctly divide between the believer and  
 unbeliever, and addressed them as different classes, or as such :  
 Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not encourage peace in any F  
 who did not believe the gospel, and that he laboured to  
 destroy all peace but the peace that arises from believing the  
 gospel : That Mr. Campbell was in the habit of confirming  
 these statements from the Scriptures in his sermons : De-  
 pones, that Mr. Campbell urged men to come to Christ from G  
 the consideration of what Christ had done for them ; and that  
 there was no peace in remaining away from Christ—and that  
 there was no salvation in remaining away from Christ : De-  
 pones, that Mr. Campbell frequently urged repentance

- A** towards God, and, when speaking to christians, urged the other christian duties : That he urged the diligent use of the means of grace. Being interrogated by Dr. Hamilton, Did Mr. Campbell teach that there was any difference in the heart of God towards believers and unbelievers, with respect
- B** to the forgiveness of their sins ? Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated at a meeting in his manse, that the love which God had towards believers was a delighting of love over them, they meeting his love, and it being reciprocal ; and that the love which he had towards unbelievers was a love, but not
- C** that kind of delighting love which he cherished towards his own people : Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not say that the remission of sins was confined to believers : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, the sins of all mankind were pardoned : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that faith is
- D** believing on the Lord Jesus Christ ; and that coming to God is having that communion with God to which witness has already deponed. Being interrogated by Dr. Graham, Whether he understood Mr. Campbell to say ; that the pardon of the sins of all men, both righteous and wicked, extended to
- E** their sins past, present, and to come ? Depones, that he cannot say. Interrogated, Whether Mr. Campbell was in the habit of praying for the forgiveness of sins in his prayers during divine service in the period libelled ? Depones, that he does not recollect that he was, that is to say, that he does
- F** not recollect his praying in the usual way for the pardon of sin : Depones, that Mr. Campbell said, that every believer must have a personal assurance of his salvation while he is believing the gospel : Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that a person who never had the assurance of salvation never
- G** fully believed the whole gospel : Depones, that in his discourse previous to the sacrament, Mr. Campbell reasoned in this way, when speaking of worthy communicants, that Christ said, " This is my body broken for you," and that the persons who could not come forward and meet this, and say,

"Yes, it has been broken for me," could not answer the end A designed by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, or words to that effect. Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot, Whether Mr. Campbell stated, that repentance toward God and other duties were binding on true believers alone? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that they were binding upon all; but B that only those who were true believers could perform them from a right motive.

Interrogated by Mr. Story, Whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that without repentance these duties could not be performed? Depones, that he understood C Mr. Campbell to teach so: Depones, that Mr. Campbell meant by repentance a change of mind, and when alluding to religious subjects, a change from Satan unto God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that so long as the mind is not 'changed or regenerated, it can have no holy feeling: Depones, D that Mr. Campbell taught that until the gospel be believed, the mind is thoroughly alienated from God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that so long as the rebellious mind is utterly ignorant of the love of God, no saving change can be effected upon it: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that E the knowledge of the love of God does not do away with any obligations of the law to holy obedience: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the knowledge of this holy love of God leads to all holy obedience, by their seeing the love of God to them, and consequently drawing out their love and F constraining them to keep his commandments.

Interrogated by Mr. Carr. As the witness has said that Mr. Campbell taught that the sins of all men are forgiven, what it is that he exhorts them to repent of? Depones, and answers, of their wickedness: Depones, that by wickedness G he means their state of rebellion and alienation from God.

Interrogated by Dr. Fleming. As the witness has said that Mr. Campbell taught that the sins of all men are forgiven, and that he taught also ~~that~~ men will be judged for their

**A** evil deeds—what are the evil deeds they are to be judged for? Depones, seeing that God has loved him, and that his sins are forgiven, that nevertheless if he do not believe, or take advantage of these privileges, at last he shall be found in a state of alienation from God, and that he will be judged **B** then according to his character, in as far as these privileges have or have not led him to holiness or to God : Depones, that the witness has heard Mr. Campbell say that it was not the mere pardon, but the *love* of him who had pardoned—and that a person might believe that pardon abstractly considered, **C** and might run to it for safety from a selfish motive : Depones, that when witness said that Mr. Campbell taught that men would be judged for their evil deeds, it was in the first place for their not seeing or not believing in this love, manifested to each individual in the world, and consequently that every **D** other sin followed.

Re-interrogated for the defender. Depones, that when he stated that he did not recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell pray for the pardon or forgiveness of sins in the usual way, he meant that Mr. Campbell did not couch that prayer in the usual **E** words : Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell, on an occasion previously referred to, to state in reference to the possibility of believing in pardon from selfish motives, that a belief in the pardon of our sins, not accompanied with the discernment, or knowledge of God's character in so pardoning them, **F** was not true faith : Depones, that from the reasoning employed by Mr. Campbell at the time, this appeared what Mr. Campbell intended to prove : Depones, that Mr. Campbell has also stated that one who believes in the pardon of his sins without loving God and becoming like God, was not **G** a true believer, or did not believe the right gospel : Depones, that when Mr. Campbell said that men would be judged for their characters, deponent understood him to refer to their conduct, or to the works which constituted their character : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell pray for the for-

giveness of sins in this sort of way—forgive our want of A love to thee, ~~and~~ pardon our giving thee so little glory, &c. Interrogated, what he means by &c.? Depones, that he means our want of joy in thee, and expressions of a similar import: Depones, that on these occasions the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to be praying for forgiveness of the B sins of believers: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness of the sins of unbelievers in this way—“For their not seeing the redemption that is in Christ for them:” Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. Campbell praying for the forgiveness of any other sin in unbelievers, C except the sin of not seeing or of rejecting the redemption that is in Christ: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell state, that, in this day of grace, all sin arose from not believing in Christ, and that the reason why they continued in sin was that they did not believe in Christ. All which is truth as the D deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) PETER M'LEOD.

REV. DR. ROBERT BURNS, one of the Ministers of Paisley, aged forty-three, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, E that he has been a minister of the Church of Scotland for twenty years: Depones, that he knows the defender. Interrogated whether he heard the defender preach at Helensburgh in September 1829; to which it was objected by F the defender, as it was previously objected to Mr. Brewster, that this did not fall within any of the ten instances mentioned in the libel. And the objection being repelled, the defender protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, took instruments and craved extracts. And the ques- G tion being put: Depones, that he heard the defender preach on the 29th September, 1829, in the school-house at Helensburgh: Depones, that the text was in the eighth chapter of Jeremiah and twenty-second verse, Is there no balm in Gilead?



A Is there no physician there? Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered? Depones, that there was very much in the sermon which struck the deponent as erroneous in point of doctrine. Interrogated whether, in that sermon, Mr. Campbell stated any thing which struck the B deponent as erroneous in regard to the matters of atonement, and pardon, and of assurance as being of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation?

Objected, that Dr. Burns, in deponing as to a sermon preached on the 29th of September, 1829, has deposed to a C sermon not contained in any one of the ten charges of the libel,—that his evidence must, therefore, be held to refer solely to the specific expressions in the previous part of the minor,—and that, while in the ten charges the libellers had left themselves the liberty of proving words having a singular D import, they have left themselves no such liberty in that previous portion of the minor, even supposing it competent to prove that portion at all, under the judgments of the Presbytery, regarding the relevancy. To which it was answered for the libellers, that where a minister is charged with holding E ing and promulgating erroneous doctrines, it is in no case necessary to prove *the precise words* used by him. It is enough to prove the substance.

And the question being put, depones, that he is not aware that there was any thing in the sermon directly upon the F subject of assurance: Depones, that the general bearing of the discourse was in favour of the doctrine of universal pardon: Depones, that the deponent has the more distinct recollection of this sermon, as he had two conversations with Mr. Campbell on the subject in the following week, or within ten days G thereafter: Depones, that the first part of the discourse had for its object to describe man's state by nature, as requiring a physician, and the second to shew that there is balm in Gilead, and a physician there: That the objection which deponent then felt to the first part of the discourse was, that,

in describing man's state by nature, there was no reference to A  
 man's condition as a guilty creature in the sight of God; but the whole design of the statement was to describe his moral alienation from God, or his hostility to the holy character of God: Depones, that in that part of the discourse which described the remedy, Mr. Campbell represented God's B  
 reconciliation of man to himself as a past act, and as a thing with which man now has nothing to do. That God loves all; and that the only way in which the balm in Gilead and the physician there can be of avail to any human being, is the simple belief that God was reconciled to all when Christ C  
 died, and that he is not now imputing sin to any. That he said in words nearly to the following effect, That it is common for the preachers of the gospel, in this country, to say, that the reason why men do not benefit by the balm in Gilead, and by the physician there, is that they are not sensible of D  
 their disease, and that they will not come to Christ for a cure. That this is not the fact: that the true reason is that they will not believe that God is a reconciled God to them—and that, as such, he is not imputing transgression to them: That all men have equally an interest in Christ, if they would truly E  
 allow themselves to think so; and that the reason why men do not enjoy peace with God is that they will not rely on his word when he says that he loves them. That in no part of the discourse did he call sinners to repentance, or to faith, except in the sense above referred to: And that towards the F  
 conclusion he used the following words, which are his very words: "Seriousness, my friends, so far from being a symptom of returning soundness, is rather a modification of the disease." Depones, that Mr. Campbell also said, that mourning for sin, or having a sense of guilt upon the conscience, G  
 had nothing to do with the state of a believer's mind at the time of his receiving the gospel: Depones, that the defender also said that the only reason why men should be sorrowful was that they did not believe God when he said that he

A loved them, and was reconciled to them : And the deponent understood him to say this in opposition to the causes usually assigned by Evangelical preachers in this country, viz. grief on account of sin : Depones, that on that occasion the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to state, that by the death B of Christ all mankind were put into a state of pardon ; and he stated this so fully that no one present could misunderstand him : Depones, that the defender stated the belief of this fact, viz. that all mankind were put into a state of pardon, was all that was necessary to constitute the faith of the C gospel : Depones that Mr. Campbell stated that the reason why professors did not enjoy peace and joy in believing, was that they did not give credit to the fact that God was not imputing sin to men, and that he loved them in particular : Depones, that he understood him to say that the refusal to D believe this fact was the unbelief condemned in Scripture, and that this was the only sin for which men, under the dispensation of grace, shall be condemned : Depones, in explanation of the date assigned to this sermon, that when he was precognosced, he was under the impression that the sermon E had been preached in the beginning of October, but that in looking into some private memoranda on the subject, he finds that it was the 29th of September.

Interrogated for the defender.—Depones, that by seriousness he understood Mr. Campbell to mean deep sense of sin F and anxiety about salvation, as he was speaking at the time of Evangelical preachers in this country exhorting their people to be serious : Depones, that in speaking of the sense of sin, Mr. Campbell meant merely not believing that God loves us : Depones, that the occasion above spoken to was the last G occasion on which deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach : That he only heard him twice before—first in Greenock in 1825, and second at Port-Glasgow in May, 1827. Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton : Depones, that in Mr. Campbell's first prayer, on the above occasion, it struck the deponent

that the only sin confessed was the sin of not believing that A  
God loved us, and there was, of course, no prayer for pardon  
of sin, but merely for the sense of pardon, or the persuasion  
that God was not imputing sin to us: And the deponent  
adds, that in the second prayer the apparent deficiency did  
not seem to be made up. Interrogated by Mr. Story, whe- B  
ther the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean by  
seriousness, all those feelings of solicitude and anxiety that  
precede believing the gospel: Depones, that he understood  
Mr. Campbell to mean all that solicitude and anxiety of  
mind, which a man feels under the powerful preaching of the C  
gospel, when he is led to inquire, What shall I do to be  
saved? Again interrogated by Mr. Story: Since the Scrip-  
tures declare that this is the commandment of God, that we  
believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, did the depo-  
nent understand Mr. Campbell to teach that all these feelings, D  
described under the general name of seriousness, preceding  
obedience to that commandment were sinful? Depones, that  
he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that all these feelings  
described under the general name of seriousness have nothing  
to do with faith, in the sense in which he, the deponent, under- E  
stood that term: Depones, that the deponent did not under-  
stand Mr. Campbell to teach that the sense of sin, or an anxiety  
to obtain an interest in Christ, had any thing to do with faith,  
which he, Mr. Campbell, seemed to consider as a mere intel-  
lectual act, or persuasion of the mind, that God is reconciled to F  
us. Interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell  
to teach that the gospel, which he was pressing upon the accept-  
ance of his hearers, could be possibly believed without any  
sense of sin? Depones, that the object of Mr. Campbell's  
discourse did not appear to be to press the acceptance of the G  
gospel upon his hearers at all, but simply to insist that they  
shall believe that God is not imputing sin to them; and that  
their not believing this was the only sin a sense of which  
seemed to be considered by him as connected with faith:

- A Depones, that Mr. Campbell represented the natural state of man as a state of moral alienation from God, meaning thereby, as he explained it, a dislike to the character of God as a holy and gracious Being. Interrogated what Mr. Campbell stated as the most likely means of overcoming this dislike? Depones, that he said that it was an exhibition of the delightful truth that God has pardoned all iniquity, and is not imputing sins unto men: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that the above manifestation of God's character was merely a manifestation of love: Depones, that the love which Mr. Campbell ascribed to the character of God was a holy love, but that the character of God as drawn by him seemed to the deponent to have excluded from it the idea of punitive justice. Interrogated, did the deponent understand Mr. Campbell to teach, that in excluding all idea of punitive justice from the effects of the manifestation of God's holy love on alienated minds, that these should not be permitted to endure any consequence of their guilt or sinfulness? Depones, that the deponent understood him to affirm that all the transgressions committed under the legal economy were forgiven, and that any suffering that was to be endured in the future world by sinners would be owing exclusively to their having rejected the gospel: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that there could not be in the mind of a Christian, after the reception of the gospel, any mourning for sin as the procuring cause of punishment, or any fears with regard to his future state: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell as saying that the only sense of sin which ought to exist in the mind of any man, either before or after believing the gospel, was grief for the sin of giving the lie to God, in not believing that he loved him, and wishing to fly from him as Adam did.

Re-interrogated for the defender, depones, that the deponent did not understand Mr. Campbell in that sermon, to say, that men ought to remain easy in their sins after believ-

ing, but the tendency of the sermon, in the deponent's A  
 opinion, was to make men easy in sin: Depones, that the  
 deponent had no reason, from the sermon, to suppose that  
 Mr. Campbell held the doctrine of universal salvation, fur-  
 ther than that, in the view of the deponent, the doctrine of  
 universal pardon necessarily leads to that universal salva- B  
 tion: Depones, that there was no specific statement with  
 regard to the sufferings consequent on the rejection of the  
 gospel, or their qualities, whether punitive or not; but he  
 stated that men would be rejected of God on account of  
 the single sin of unbelief: Depones, that in the opinion of C  
 the deponent, what Mr. Campbell stated in that sermon,  
 militated against the Scriptures, which say that men shall be  
 judged for every evil deed done in the body. And all this is  
 truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) ROBERT BURNS. D

The Rev. WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, Minister of the  
 Gospel, Greenock, aged twenty-five, unmarried, being so-  
 lemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial  
 counsel, depones, that he is assistant minister of the new E  
 parish of Greenock: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell  
 preach in the month of April, 1830, in the Floating-Chapel  
 at Greenock: Depones, that he took notes of the sermon,  
 and from these notes, now in his possession, he finds that  
 Mr. Campbell said, "Before I can say to a man fear God and F  
 give him glory, I must know that his condemnation is taken  
 away—that his sins are forgiven." "It is a fact at this  
 moment of every person present that his sins are put away,  
 and if I did not know this, I could not say to you, fear God  
 and give him glory, because it would be an impossibility." G  
 "I could not conceive any thing that I could ask of God which  
 he has not told me that he has already given me."—"Christ's  
 right to judge men is, that he has redeemed them. Judg-  
 ment presupposes our forgiveness. It is as persons who

A have been forgiven that we shall be judged." "We cannot repent and give God glory, unless we now have forgiveness." Interrogated for the defender, depones, that the only other occasion on which deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell preach was two or three years ago in Edinburgh: Depones, that B deponent took down the above notes, because the statements by Mr. Campbell, so taken down, were different from what he had been accustomed to hear on these points: Depones, that he took some other notes of the sermon, which are as follow—"To fear God is to know and delight in him. To C give God glory is to praise him. The liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, is a liberty to fear God and give him glory." "This" (whereby the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean the provision for enabling men to fear God and give him glory, consisting in their sins being for- D given) "is but a part of the truth. We must know and love God's character. To this, two things are necessary—first, that God shew himself—second, that I have eyes to see him. God shews himself in Christ." Mr. Campbell also said, "The future judgment and coming wrath is that E which makes God altogether lovely." Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. Campbell speaking of responsibility of man, in the sense in which that word is commonly understood. Interrogated whether Mr. Campbell spoke of the responsibility under which man is placed by God's work in F Christ? Depones, in substance, perhaps, in stating the ground of the final judgment. Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to make this the ground of the final judgment, that men had been pardoned, and had rejected the pardon: Depones, that the general connexion of the two G first sentences quoted by the deponent from his notes, lay in the provision which God had made to enable man to fear him and give him glory: Depones, that Mr. Campbell's text was a passage in the fourteenth chapter of the book of Revelation, and the sixth and seventh verses. Re-interro-

gated for the libellers, depones, that he understood Mr. A Campbell in that sermon to preach the doctrine of universal pardon. Interrogated by Mr. Story, depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to have said in substance, that unless a minister of the gospel knew that Christ had died for sinners, he could not say, when preaching to the people, fear God and B give him glory: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that if Christ had not died for sinners, such a barrier would have existed between God and the sinner that obedience to the precept fear God and give him glory would have been impossible. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall C answer to God.

(Signed) WM. CUNNINGHAM.

It was here minuted, on the admission of Mr. Campbell, that the three volumes entitled Numbers One, Two, and Three D of Notes of Sermons by the Rev. J. M. Campbell, Minister of Row, Dumbartonshire, taken in Short-hand, and published at Greenock, and which are marked by the Moderator, are to the best of his belief, what they profess to be.

(Signed) JOHN M'L. CAMPBELL. E

ROBERT M'FARLANE, farmer in Greenfield, parish of Row, aged about fifty, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he is a hearer of Mr. Campbell: Depones, that he has F heard Mr. Campbell, more than once, state from the pulpit, that, in consequence of the death of Christ, our sins, past, present, and to come, were pardoned, if we believed it: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say that unless a man believes that his own sins are forgiven he makes God a liar: G Depones, that he met Mr. Campbell in August last in the house of John M'Farlane in the parish of Row: Depones, that on this occasion Mr. Campbell gave the deponent a copy of a sermon, preached by him in the Floating Chapel at



A Greenock : Depones, that the copy now shewn to him, and marked by the Moderator, is the same sermon : Depones, that when Mr. Campbell gave the deponent this sermon, the deponent said he believed he had one of the same already, on which Mr. Campbell took out a copy and gave it to the B witness, and said, That is one which I preached in the Floating Chapel. Interrogated by Dr. Graham : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell, in his prayers, pray for the pardon of sin, but not generally : Depones, that the deponent did not join in the sacrament at Row on the last occasion, C but he was present at the sermon by Mr. Campbell previous to the sacrament : Depones, that his reason for not joining was, that he did not think he was in the frame of mind which Mr. Campbell said was necessary for partaking of the ordinance : Depones, that he does not recollect what Mr. Campbell D stated in regard to the frame of mind on that occasion.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot, whether he understood Mr. Campbell, in praying for the pardon of sin, to pray for the pardon of sins generally, or merely for the pardon of a particular sin ? Depones, that the deponent understood him E to pray for the pardon of sins generally. Interrogated by Dr. Graham what was his reason for not thinking that he had the character which Mr. Campbell said was necessary for joining in the ordinance ? And the deponent having answered that his reason was that Mr. Campbell had stated in F July, 1829, as the deponent thinks, at the dispensation of the sacrament, that no person ought to partake of the ordinance who was not assured of his own salvation, and the deponent did not think that he was in that state, and as the deponent, in his own opinion, was in the same state at the G time of the sacrament in 1830, he, therefore, did not join in the sacrament on that occasion ; and Mr. Campbell had not in the interval said any thing to induce the deponent to change his opinion, nor himself stated a different view of the subject from what he had stated in July, 1829. It was

here objected for the defender, that the sacrament in July, A 1829, was not within the libel,—that the evidence to be led must ultimately regard not the consequences, but the character of Mr. Campbell's teaching, within the time libelled,—and that, although it might be competent to establish the character of the teaching at the sacrament, 1830, by its con- B sequences, it was not competent to prove the teaching at the sacrament in 1829, merely because certain of its consequences might fall within the period of the libel. The Presbytery sustained the objection; against which the libellers protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glas- C gow and Ayr, took instruments, and craved extracts. And the deponent being again interrogated by Dr. Hamilton, whether Mr. Campbell ever stated, during the twelve months embraced in the libel, that a man might be a Christian, or a worthy communicant, without the assurance of his own sal- D vation? Depones, that he cannot recollect. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) ROBERT M'FARLANE.

JAMES BROWNE, parochial teacher in Row, aged about 30 E years, married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he is the parochial schoolmaster at Row, and has been so for eight years: Depones, that he has regularly attended the church of Row since Mr. Campbell became minister, in 1825: Depones, F that he attended church pretty regularly during the twelve months embraced in the libel: Depones, that he was in the habit of making notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons at the time they were delivered; and he is in possession of the notes of a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell at Row, on the 5th G of September, 1830. (Objection stated to Rev. Mr. Brewster and Dr. Burns repeated.) Depones, that on that occasion Mr. Campbell said, "It has been testified to you also that you are sinners. No man naturally knows this. The

A whole natural man is one mass of rebellion. No good thing in you seen by God. It is not strange this should be unwellcome to flesh and blood. Men say they like to have their faults told them, but still they have a way of escape from the edge of the thing charged against them. This is not what B you have been accustomed to hear, viz. the particular forms of sin, but the root of all sin. A line has been drawn between the natural man and the new man. The form in which you have been taught these truths is in the gift of Christ,—that Christ has died for every man, and if this be C denied, then I cannot prove that God is love. If you prove that Christ only died for the elect, then from the number God has created, and has not died for them, but created them for misery, I can prove that God is hatred. The fact of Christ having died for all, teaches you that all are sinners,” D “It is the sealing of God’s judgment upon them, that Christ has tasted death for every man.” Depones, that what has now been stated, ~~was~~ the end of one head of the discourse : Depones, that under another head he said, “Farther, you have been taught that you are heirs of God. It seems strange E that men, who are so desirous of honour, should reject this ; yet there is no one thing that men hate or dislike more than when we say I am a child of God,—have the Spirit of God,—the feelings,—the mind of God,—that I am a son, to reign a king on the earth. Unless you know yourselves to be in F this condition, you are not a child of God.” Depones, that from the deponent’s recollection of Mr. Campbell’s sermons during the twelve months embraced in the libel, he can say that he taught that all sins were forgiven, the sin of unbelief excepted : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the love G of God was equal to every man alike : Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that Christ has died for, and redeemed every man, in the same sense : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say, that it was a sin to pray for an interest in Christ, or something similar to that : Depones,

that the reason assigned by Mr. Campbell for this was, that A every man had the interest he required in Christ already : Depones, that the impression on the deponent's mind was, that the assurance of salvation was necessary to a man's being a Christian : Depones, that he cannot recollect whether Mr. Campbell, during the twelve months libelled, ever illustrated B the subject of assurance by referring to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say something to this effect, that a man could not be a Christian, or in a right state, unless he were assured, that if he were to die the next moment he would be safe or saved : C Depones, that the deponent thinks that it is nearly the same thing to be a Christian, and to be in a right state, and the deponent sees no difference, so far as the preceding sentence is concerned, between the words "safe" and "saved :"  
 Depones, that the deponent heard Mr. Campbell's ser- D mon at Row, on the occasion of the Presbyterial visitation in July, 1830 : Depones, that the Lecture was upon the first twelve verses of the fifth chapter of Matthew : Depones, that the witness cannot, from recollection, say any thing as to the contents of that sermon : Depones, that the impression E on the deponent's mind is, that the subject of that sermon did not lead Mr. Campbell to the subjects of universal pardon and assurance, and that the deponent does not recollect Mr. Campbell alluding to these subjects on that occasion.

Interrogated whether it struck the deponent that this ser- F mon was different from the ordinary run of Mr. Campbell's discourses, in his not treating of the subjects of pardon and assurance ? Depones, that it did not strike the deponent that Mr. Campbell, on this occasion, entered so fully into the subjects of pardon and assurance as formerly : Depones, that G he has heard Mr. Campbell on former occasions discourse on the same subjects from the same text, and in the same way.

Interrogated for the defender : Depones, that before the 8th of July, 1830, Mr. Campbell had been preaching regard-

A ing the second coming of our Lord : Depones, that there was a good deal on that subject in the sermon preached on the 8th of July, 1830, in exposition of the text : Depones, that deponent understood that Mr. Campbell was limited in point of time on that occasion : Depones, that it did not strike the B deponent that the sermon was curtailed ; and he thinks that it was from an hour to an hour and a half : Depones, that Mr. Campbell is in the habit of applying his discourse to his hearers at the end : Depones, that he cannot distinctly say whether, in Mr. Campbell's sermons in general, the topics of C pardon and assurance are, or are not, more prominently brought forward in the application of his sermon to his hearers at the end, than in the rest of his discourse.

Being interrogated, if when Mr. Campbell stated that unless a man was so assured as to know that he would be D saved were he to die, he was not a christian, or in a right state before God, Mr. Campbell meant that no christian could ever be in a wrong state before God ? Depones, and answers, certainly not : Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in speaking of an interest in Christ, did not mean to say, as it appeared to E the deponent, that every man had come to Christ—but that because Christ had redeemed all men, all men had equally a right and title to come to Christ.

Being interrogated if Mr. Campbell, when stating that it was a sin to pray for an interest in Christ, or words to that F effect, meant that interest which a believer, or one who knows God, has in Christ ? Depones, and answers that the interest which all men have in Christ, viz. their right and title to come to Christ, is not the same with the interest of a believer in Christ, by which interest deponent understands the benefits G which the believer receives in having come to Christ.

Interrogated what the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean by the love of God to all men being equal ? Depones, and answers, just that God's affection was equal to all men, and that there was no peculiar love. And by saying that

there is no peculiar love, the deponent means to refer to the A state in which God finds the creature at first : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that what was well pleasing to God in man, was man's return to him : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, as the deponent understands, that all men had not returned to God : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, cer- B tainly, that while man did not return to God, they were not well pleasing to him : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that men returned to God by faith in Christ : Depones, that the impression which the deponent has of Mr. Campbell's teaching, is that without faith in Christ, there can be no sal- C vation : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that those who were not well pleasing to God, would be finally damned : Depones, that by the sin of unbelief, deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean man's persisting in not returning to God : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that actual sin D flowed from the original corruption inherent in the creature by the fall : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the way of deliverance from actual sin was by the sanctifying influence of the Spirit; and that without the sanctification of the Spirit, there could be no deliverance from actual sin : E Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that upon the creature believing or returning to God, then the sanctification of the Spirit commenced : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that Christ had redeemed every man by the redemption price, being the same for all, and equally F extensive : Depones, that when Mr. Campbell stated that all men were redeemed by Christ, deponent did not understand Mr. Campbell to mean that they were thereby to be all finally delivered from wrath : Depones, that when Mr. Campbell taught that Christ died for all men, he occasionally G added, God's intention in this was that the creature should return to God : Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell explain the word "pardon" in preaching: That the explanation was, that sin had interposed a barrier between God

A and the creature, and that by the death of Christ this judicial barrier was removed : Depones, that deponent has never understood Mr. Campbell's teaching as an encouragement to unholiness : Depones, that Mr. Campbell generally divided his hearers into classes in preaching, viz. believers and unbelievers : Depones, that Mr. Campbell assigned to unbelievers the absence of peace and joy : That he cannot distinctly recollect about his saying any thing about holiness of character on these occasions : That in regard to their conduct he cannot specify particularly, or generally, what he said.

C Interrogated by Dr. Graham : Does the pardon of sin mean the doing away the liableness to punishment as used by Mr. Campbell ? Depones, and answers that such was not deponent's impression : Depones, that by the removal of the judicial barrier which deponent has already stated as the D meaning assigned by Mr. Campbell to pardon, deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean the right and title to come to God : Depones, that the deponent cannot recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell use the necessity of the assurance of salvation in reference to the sacrament.

E Interrogated by Dr. Graham whether Mr. Campbell in his public prayers even prays for pardon of sin ? To which question it was objected, that it did not fall within the minor of the libel ; and the objection being answered by the libellers, the Presbytery repelled the objection, Mr. Story dissenting, and the defender protested for leave to appeal to the F Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, took instruments, and craved extracts. And the question being put : Depones, that he cannot distinctly answer as to the time, but that he has heard him do so : Depones, that the deponent cannot say that it is G his impression that during the twelve months libelled, Mr. Campbell was in the habit of regularly praying every Sunday for pardon of sin.

I Reinterrogated for the defender : Depones, that Mr. Campbell, when speaking of the right and title of all men to come

to God, meant, that they were to come from a state of alien- A  
ation: Depones, that when the deponent said that Mr.  
Campbell was not altogether regular in praying for the par-  
don of sin, the deponent referred to the want of the thing,  
and not to the form of the expression: Depones, that the  
deponent does not recollect that in those prayers in which B  
Mr. Campbell did not pray for the pardon of sin, there was  
any confession of sin.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that he cannot  
recollect whether Mr. Campbell prayed for deliverance from  
the power of sin. C

Interrogated whether Mr. Campbell ever prayed for deliv-  
erance from the consequences of sin? Depones, that he can-  
not recollect.

Interrogated whether the deponent recollects about what  
Mr. Campbell prayed? Depones, that he cannot recollect. D

Interrogated whether the deponent understood Mr. Camp-  
bell to teach that, when he said that Christ had redeemed  
every man by the redemption price being the same for all  
and equally extensive; that there was any necessary connex-  
ion between the paying of that price and any change in the E  
mind of those for whom it was paid? Depones, and answers  
that he cannot recollect. All which is truth, as the deponent  
shall answer to God.

(Signed) JAMES BROWNE.

JAMES BAIN, Student of Divinity, residing in Easterton, F  
near Helensburgh, being examined in initialibus: Depones,  
that deponent resided during winter 1829 and 1830, in the  
house of Mr. Parlane M<sup>r</sup>Farlane, one of the libellers in this  
case, and was there in March 1830: Depones, Mr. M<sup>r</sup>Farlane G  
was one who signed a memorial to the Presbytery of Dumbar-  
ton in that month, in reference to the defender: Depones, that  
before the memorial was prepared, deponent knew, from con-  
versations in the family, that the memorial was to be prepared:



- A Depones, that deponent neither gave any opinion or advice as to the preparation of the memorial: Depones, that the deponent in saying "as to the preparation of the memorial," he means that he neither advised that it should be prepared, nor advised what should be put into it, as far as he can
- B recollect: Depones, that he is well acquainted with six of the libellers: Depones, that until he saw the names of the libellers, at the libel now in court, he did not know from their own mouths, that any but M'Lellan and Lennox were libellers: Depones, that deponent did not construct the
- C memorial himself: Depones, that deponent wrote it over: Depones, that he wrote it over before it was presented: Depones, that one evening towards the end of March, Mr. M'Lellan came to Mr. M'Farlane's house, and in presence of the deponent, produced a petition in reference to Mr.
- D Campbell, and addressed to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, and stated to Mr. M'Farlane that there was to be a meeting of certain parishioners at the Row, to consider what steps it would be proper for them to take in reference to Mr. Campbell, and that, if a petition was to be agreed upon, it would
- E be proper to consult about the form beforehand: That the petition brought up by Mr. M'Lellan was produced by him, and was read in presence of Mr. M'Farlane and deponent, and Mr. Archibald Turner, who came along with Mr. M'Lellan, and brother of Peter Turner, one of the libellers,
- F and probably in presence of Mr. Robert M'Farlane of Greenfield, who came in during the discussion that evening, and in presence of other members of the family, male and female: Depones, that deponent is not prepared to say that the petition was not handed to deponent: Depones, that deponent
- G can neither affirm or deny that he read the petition during the discussion: Depones, that deponent read the petition, but whether that evening or next morning he cannot say: Depones, that deponent did not see Mr. M'Lellan there next morning: Depones, that the petition was left in Mr. M'Far-

lane's house that night : Depones, that deponent thinks it A was Mr. M'Farlane who gave him the petition that evening or next morning : Depones, that in the course of that evening several alterations in the petition were agreed upon : Depones, that the alterations were mutually agreed upon between Mr. M'Lellan and Mr. M'Farlane, and that Mr. B M'Farlane suggested them : Depones, that deponent does not recollect of any alterations or suggestions being made that night, except by Mr. M'Lellan and Mr. M'Farlane : Depones, that next morning Mr. M'Farlane requested the deponent to write over the petition with the alterations agreed C upon—that deponent did so—that deponent did so, as he would have done any other piece of writing, to oblige Mr. M'Farlane : Depones, that neither on that evening, nor on the subsequent morning, does the deponent recollect that his opinion and advice were either asked or given on the subject, D as the uniform principle which the deponent held, was, that as he did not understand any sort of proceedings before Presbyteries, he would not give any advice about it : Depones, that the alterations according to which deponent wrote out the petition were verbal. That in obedience to these E verbal suggestions, deponent wrote the memorial as it afterwards appeared : Depones, that the memorial was Mr. M'Lellan's petition altered. That in the memorial so prepared, there was nothing but the original petition, together with the alterations agreed upon : Depones, that Mr. M'Far- F lane wished it to be called a memorial as agreed : Depones, that deponent took the petition and modified it according to the verbal instructions, writing it out in the form of the memorial afterwards presented to the Presbytery. That Mr. M'Farlane, junior, copied out the memorial which the G deponent had written : Depones, that deponent's copy was carelessly written as to penmanship : Depones, that he does not recollect at whose suggestion the copy was taken by young M'Farlane : Depones, that part was copied by M'Far-

A lane, junior, in deponent's presence : Depones, that it was never suggested to the deponent, that young M'Farlane's copy should be taken instead of his, in order that the deponent might be a witness : Depones, that deponent never attended any meeting of the memorialists as memorialists :  
 B Depones, that deponent was not present at any meeting of the libellers consulting about the libel, between the date of the Presbyterial visitation and the presenting of the libel.

It was moved by the defender that this witness should only be received *cum nota*. But the Presbytery repelled  
 C the objection, and the witness being solemnly sworn, and examined *in causâ* : Depones, that he is about 35 years of age, and unmarried : Depones, that he is a student of divinity, and that he entered the Divinity Hall about nine years ago : Depones, that he resides in the parish of Row, and has  
 D done so since October, 1828 : Depones, that he has attended the church of Row pretty regularly since that time, and it has been his ordinary place of worship, and he is a member of the church : Depones, that during that time he has frequently taken notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons : Depones,  
 E that he was induced to take notes, partly because from the length of Mr. Campbell's sermons he found it difficult to recollect them, and partly from what he considered certain peculiarities in Mr. Campbell's doctrine : Depones, that in consequence of this he considers that he has a very distinct  
 F recollection of these peculiarities : Depones, that the deponent has notes in his possession of sermons preached by Mr. Campbell during the "twelve months libelled : Depones, that he took these notes in church at the time, in pencil, and he has since copied them for his own use, and now has them .  
 G Depones, that the first sermon of which he has notes during that period he recollects was preached on a Sunday in the church of Row, in October, 1829.

Objection repeated as before as to Mr. Brewster and Dr. Burns, and Mr. James Browne.

Depones, that in that sermon, Mr. Campbell stated, re- A  
 pentance consists in this, that whereas a person that is unre-  
 generated does not rejoice in God, he immediately on being  
 regenerated does so rejoice. Many people tell us, they are  
 sensible how defective their outward conduct is,—they sin  
 daily, they say,—even their best services are exceedingly B  
 imperfect and unworthy, but their intentions are good.  
 They sincerely endeavour to abstain from sinning, and to be  
 holy, but the truth is, all such persons only attempt to deceive  
 us. Their external behaviour is cognisable by their neigh-  
 bours,—they of course plead guilty of faults which they C  
 cannot conceal,—but their hearts being secure from the  
 scrutiny of others, they assert that their hearts are right.  
 But if they would confess the truth, they would declare  
 that every thought, every motion of their heart, is utterly  
 vile,—is only abominable rebellion against God. The gospel D  
 which is commonly preached in this country, which is called  
 gospel, but which, indeed, is not gospel, makes a man sorry  
 first, in order that it may make him rejoice afterward ; but  
 the gospel which I preach makes a man rejoice as soon as he  
 hears it. It, therefore, is the only gospel. Nothing can be E  
 gospel which does not make a man rejoice as soon as he  
 hears it. I do not say that every one who hears me preach  
 rejoices immediately,—the reason is this, he will not believe  
 what I tell him. My meaning is, that a man on hearing me  
 must rejoice, provided he believe what I say.” Depones, F  
 that what is above stated is all which the deponent took  
 down at the time, but from recollection of the conclusion of  
 Mr. Campbell’s sermon, he can say that the substance of that  
 part of it was, “ That he who will not receive the message  
 delivered by Mr. Campbell, viz. the doctrine that the sins of G  
 every individual are done away in Christ, and that God does  
 not impute to any one his trespasses, and that God is not  
 reconciled to every one present, is about to be engulfed in  
 the blackness of darkness in a very short time.” Depones,

- A** that the next sermon of which the deponent took notes, was preached on the 29th of March, 1830: Depones, that the proper subject of this sermon, which was on an occasion of an ordination of elders, was to point out the nature and objects of the institution of a visible church, upon which subject
- B** Mr. Campbell said generally, "That the object of it was to communicate to the rest of the world the light which was in the individual members of the church, and to keep up the knowledge of God in the world. And he further stated, that the individual members were thus intended to be witnesses for God, and that no one could be a witness in this
- C** sense, unless he experienced that of which he testifies. And that he cannot declare the love of God, unless he knows from experience that God loves him. He cannot make known the riches of God's mercy, unless he has experienced
- D** it in the forgiveness of his own sins,—nor the extent of his beneficence, unless he knows that he has bestowed eternal life on him." Depones, that the deponent also took notes of a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell at Row on the 4th of April, 1830. That the proper subject of that sermon
- E** seemed to be the Millennial state, but on this occasion also Mr. Campbell introduced his doctrines on subjects both of pardon and assurance of salvation. That towards the beginning of his discourse he spoke of two classes of persons who err in religion,—"*first*, those who allege that the true
- F** believer endeavours as far as he can to be holy, and trusts to the merits of Christ to make up for the deficiency of his obedience. They think he has some merit in God's sight, and since God is merciful, he will on account of Christ's merits, forgive that wherein his own merits fall short. *Se-*
- G** *cond*, Those who admit that they have nothing whatever in themselves to recommend them to God, but that the merits of Christ are their only ground of hope,—who moreover declare that Christ's obedience is infinitely meritorious, adequate to expiate for ten thousand worlds, and many such

idle compliments they pay it,—but they will not affirm positively that Christ died for them, or made an atonement for their sins. The latter class are unbelievers equally as the former, and shall be ranked with them at the day of judgment.” Depones, that toward the conclusion of his discourse Mr. Campbell again returned to these topics, and in summing up the difference between his opinions and those entertained by the generality of persons, he said, “You say you hope God will be merciful to you at the day of judgment; I maintain that that day will not be a day of mercy, but of strict justice. You say you seek an interest in Christ; I say you have an interest in Christ already, all the interest you will ever have in him. You say you hope your sins will be remitted; I say they are all already remitted.” Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row, in May, 1830. That his text was Romans viii. 17, and the subject of the sermon seemed to be the connexion between suffering and being glorified, in the case of Christ and his followers. That in his sermon, in the afternoon on that occasion, Mr. Campbell referred to the parable of the good Samaritan, and said, that in this parable, Christ meant himself by the good Samaritan; and that Christ loved every child of Adam as he loved himself, and thus he is the good Samaritan: Depones, that the deponent took notes of another sermon preached in June or July 1830, at Row. That the subject of this sermon was to exhibit the loveliness of Christ as the King that shall reign in righteousness: Depones, that in that sermon Mr. Campbell said, that “the common blessings enjoyed by man are a proof that their sins are forgiven; therefore, we err in thinking that the darkness in which the heathens live, saves them from condemnation.” Depones, that the deponent has also notes of a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell, at Row, on the 4th of July, 1830: Depones, that the object of this sermon seemed to be to shew the extent of the curse consequent on the fall

A of Adam, and the extent of the blessing consequent on the redemption of man by Christ : Depones, that in that sermon Mr. Campbell said that every man is in this condition, that while he has in him death in Adam, he has life given him in Christ : Depones, that Mr. Campbell also said, that the blessing of life in Christ, is co-extensive with the curse, and belongs to all upon whom the curse has passed. That in another part of the same sermon Mr. Campbell said, that we are all under a blessing as well as a curse ; as Adam originated death to all, so Christ tasted death for every man :

C Depones, that the deponent again heard Mr. Campbell at Row, on 8th July, before the Presbytery. That on that occasion, Mr. Campbell said, in substance, that God loved, and Christ died for every human being. And the deponent was struck with Mr. Campbell using a very strong expression to that effect in the end of his discourse : Depones, that although Mr Campbell did not, in that sermon, dilate so much on this topic as the deponent had heard him on other occasions, yet the deponent understood him to maintain, in the end of his discourse, that by the death of Christ the sins of every man were taken away : Depones, that Mr. Campbell said that peacemakers are those who, like Christ, reconcile men to God : Depones, that the deponent's impression of what Mr. Campbell said, in another part of that sermon was, that the atonement of Christ, instead of applying to the elect only, applied to all men equally : Depones, that the deponent has notes of another sermon, preached by Mr. Campbell, at Row, on the 18th of July, 1830, being the Sunday before the sacrament ;—that the subject of the sermon was the true scripture doctrine of self-examination—that on this occasion Mr. Campbell said, “ the common doctrine on this point is, that when the scripture enjoins that a man examine himself, it requires him to do so with the object of ascertaining whether he is a believer or not. This is never enjoined in scripture ;—there is but one passage in

scripture which seems to support this idea, viz. 2 Cor. xiii. A  
 5. It is an erroneous comment on this passage, which affords  
even the least ground for such an opinion. When Paul says  
 to the Corinthians, examine yourselves whether ye be in the  
 faith; prove your own selves—he does not lay down a for-  
 mal precept. The true scope of the passage is this—you B  
 seek a proof of my apostleship—rather ask, are you your-  
 selves believers. If you are, it is through my ministry you  
 are so. If you have faith—if Christ be formed in you, and  
 that this is a fact, you will not at all question, then am I an  
 apostle, for your faith is a proof of my apostleship. You C  
 would prove me—if so, just prove yourselves; but this is not  
 needful, seeing you know yourselves that Christ is in you.  
 This is the true meaning of Paul's reasoning. It is an ex-  
 ceedingly fundamental error to require a man who has not  
 assurance to examine himself—it is to send me to look into D  
 my heart to know whether the love of God be in my heart,  
 when the love of God cannot be there. What then is the  
 use of self-examination? Those who have assurance may need  
 self-examination to ascertain whether they be in a fit state  
 for communicating. It is not true that those who have faith E  
 are at all times fit for sitting down at the communion table  
 —the table may be filled with real christians, and not one  
 worthy communicant among them all.” Depones, that the  
 deponent attended at the celebration of the sacrament, in  
 July 1830; and that Mr. Campbell, in his sermon, previous F  
 to the celebration of the ordinance, taught in substance, as  
 the deponent understood, that whoever came to communicate,  
 not having an assurance of his own sins being taken away,  
 and of his being a child of God, and certain of his salvation,  
 did not come worthily, and had no right to communicate: G  
 Depones, that the deponent was not in a favourable situation  
 for taking notes, and took no notes: Depones, that the de-  
 ponent has frequently heard Mr. Campbell say, in substance,  
 that there could be no such thing as faith in Christ, in any



- A individual, without a persuasion or assurance in his mind that his sins were forgiven, and that he was a child of God : Depones, that Mr. Campbell frequently taught a doctrine of the following import—That if a man doubted of his own state, or disbelieved the remission of his own sins, he thereby made God a liar—because he said that it was stated in the scriptures that the sins of all men were forgiven, and that consequently the sins of every individual were forgiven, and that by doubting of this in his own case, any man who did so, disbelieved the testimony of God, and thereby made God a liar.

Interrogated for defender: Depones, that in the sermon above spoken to, as preached in the end of June, or beginning of July 1830, Mr. Campbell, in that part of the discourse which followed his statement regarding the responsibility of the heathen, added, in substance, that while the heathen are justly condemned in consequence of the light they have with respect to the forgiveness of their sins, the Gentile churches, under an infinitely clearer light, have exhibited a much greater degree of depravity than the heathen, and in consequence of this have subjected themselves to an infinitely greater condemnation: Depones, that in shortly defining the character spoken of in Matthew fifth, verses first to twelfth, the text of the visitation sermon, Mr. Campbell stated that the mourners are those whose attention has been carried off from outward things to sin. The sin of the world is the object of their sorrow. These are the mourners of Zion spoken of elsewhere in scripture. The meek correspond to the poor in spirit, with this difference, that meekness has reference to man's poverty of spirit to God: Depones, that the notes which deponent has employed are what he took down at the time, as partly in Mr. Campbell's words, and partly in his own, expressing what he understood to be the substance of Mr. Campbell's statements, adding that when he was not sure of the accuracy of any thing, he did

not take it down : Depones, that the reason assigned by Mr. A Campbell for the gospel's giving joy to him that heard it, was, that the doctrine contained in it, viz. that the sins of all men were forgiven, was calculated to give joy to whoever believed it, as he must believe that his sins were forgiven, and what can be more joyful than for one to learn that his sins are B forgiven : Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to use the phrase "good news" as synonymous with gospel : Depones, that Mr. Campbell preached that a man's turning from Satan to God is simultaneous with his joy in believing the gospel : That the deponent understood Mr. Campbell C to state that turning from Satan unto God was the same as believing the fact that his sins are forgiven : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a great many more things besides the belief of that fact arose from, or were consequent upon the turning from Satan to God. That although the belief D of that fact was the turning from Satan to God, yet other things were inseparably connected with it : Depones, that the sermon preached on the twenty-ninth of March 1830, was preached before certain members of Presbytery appointed by the Presbytery to assist Mr. Campbell in the ordination E of elders.

Being interrogated whether on the fourth of April 1830, or at any other time within the libel, deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach that all men had the same interest in Christ which believers had ? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught F that all men have an equal interest in Christ, and that unbelievers being men, the deponent understood him to mean that they had an equal interest in Christ with believers.

Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that believers had any different interest in Christ from unbelievers : De- G ponos, that he cannot say that he ever heard Mr. Campbell explain the difference : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that believers had the Holy Spirit dwelling in them : Depones, that Mr. Campbell has not taught that unbeliev-

A ers have the Holy Spirit dwelling in them ; but has taught the contrary : Depones, that Mr. Campbell has spoken of the Church as being Christ's body, and of believers as being members of that body : Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in speaking of the visible church, stated that by far the greater portion of the members of the visible church were not believers : Depones, that deponent, as far as he can recollect, has never heard Mr. Campbell state that unbelievers were true members of Christ's body : Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell state, that those who die in unbelief would inherit the kingdom of heaven.

Interrogated, whether the deponent has ever heard Mr. Campbell say that God rejoiced in contemplating unbelievers : Depones, that he cannot say, absolutely, that Mr. Campbell may not have used such an expression, but he thinks it more probable that he did not. Interrogated if Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers were in rebellion against God ? Depones, and answers, Yes. Interrogated if Mr. Campbell taught that God hated iniquity ? Depones, and answers, Yes.

E. Interrogated by Dr. Graham : Depones, that Mr. Campbell has taught that unbelievers were to be consigned to the blackness of darkness, and such expressions, and subjected to inconceivable punishment : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say, that the condemnation under the gospel, was not that we had disobeyed the law, but that we had rejected the gospel. And on another day Mr. Campbell said, " I am asked whether unbelief is the only sin that will be punished ? " to which he answered, that it was not the unbelief, but the evil heart from which the unbelief proceeded ; that was the cause of punishment : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers were those who do not believe that the sins of all are done away in Christ, and that their sins are included in this ; and that the love of God embraces all men : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say, in

substance, although he cannot speak to the particular words, A that every one who had not assurance, was a child of the devil and an heir of hell—meaning thereby assurance of salvation.

Interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell say, that his views upon assurance and pardon were different from B those entertained by the Church of Scotland? Depones, that he cannot say positively, that Mr. Campbell spoke of the Church of Scotland; but he has heard him say, very often, that his views were different from those which almost all ministers taught, and almost every body believed. C

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot: Did Mr. Campbell teach that unbelievers, understanding by that, a person who does not believe that God loves him, or that Christ died for every man, are, from that cause, full of enmity and rebellion against God? Depones and answers, that they were so because of D the natural corruption of their nature; and that although God was reconciled to them, they were not reconciled to God.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in teaching that the love of God embraces all men, did not, as the deponent understood, teach that all men feel it as those E do who are reconciled to him: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the guilt of those who do not feel God's love in the way that those who are reconciled feel it, is the highest of all guilt: Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell, in teaching his doctrine of the assurance of faith, contrasted it with F that faith which is unaccompanied with any sense of the love of God? Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. Campbell's having so contrasted it in that way: Depones, that Mr. Campbell contrasted his doctrine of assurance with the doctrine of those who had some doubts whether they should be G made the recipients of the full amount of God's bounty, although they hoped that they would be so: Depones, that Mr. Campbell certainly represented a sense of God's goodness not to be a right sense, as long as the individual was ig-

**A** norant of God in Christ Jesus : Depones, that his impression of Mr. Campbell's teaching is, that he represents the forgiveness of sins as identical with the removal of the barrier which sin has created between God and the creature—by which the deponent means, that Mr. Campbell said that the forgiveness of sins included the removal of the barrier between God and man : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach, moreover, that the forgiveness of sins included the resurrection of the body, and the redemption of the soul and body : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the gift of personal salvation to all men, is included in the forgiveness of sins, but not the possession of that gift : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the reason why, although all men had the gift of personal salvation, those who did not believe, had not the possession of it was, that they would not have it : Depones, that he thinks Mr. Campbell represented the gift of personal salvation as involved in the gift of forgiveness. Interrogated what more is included in the forgiveness of sins than the removal of the barrier between God and man, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching ? Depones, that the deponent considers he has already answered this question. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the belief of one's personal salvation is identical with, or included in believing the record, or is an inference from that belief ? Depones, that Mr. Campbell's views, to the deponent's apprehension, had some indistinctness or variation at different times : Depones, that he has frequently heard Mr. Campbell charge those who had not the assurance of their own salvation, with disbelieving the record : Depones, that he has heard him at other times say, that personal salvation ought to be inferred from the pardon of sins : Depones, that he has heard him at other times speak of faith and assurance, in his discourses, as if the terms were convertible : Depones, that he does not think that Mr. Campbell has ever preached that faith may be interrupted or suspended in the believer's mind ; but the de-

ponent understood him to teach that there might be different A degrees of faith, or that faith might be impaired : Depones, that the deponent has never heard Mr. Campbell teach that assurance might be increased ; and he has never been able to catch any such idea, although he has often watched for it. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God. B

(Signed) JAMES BAIN.

PETER BAIN, teacher, Garelochhead, aged twenty-eight, unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel : Depones, that he has been C teacher at Garelochhead for seven years—and has resided there during that time, except when attending College during winter : Depones, that he has been in the habit of attending the parish church of Row during that period, and his attendance has been regular, and he is a member of the church : D Depones, that he began to take notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons in the summer of 1829, and he was induced to do so from thinking that some of Mr. Campbell's doctrines were peculiar and erroneous : Depones, that these peculiarities related to the doctrines of atonement, and pardon, and E of assurance : Depones, that from the time when he began to take notes he paid particular attention to Mr. Campbell's discourses : Depones, that he was present at Row when the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered by Mr. Campbell in July 1830 : Depones, that on that occasion he F heard Mr. Campbell's address, after serving of the tables, to the communicants.

(Objection on the minor repeated.)

Depones, that Mr. Campbell said that the sins of all men were pardoned, and he taught that every man should believe G that—and that no one was a true christian until he did so. And that every one who believed must be certain that his own sins were forgiven as well as the rest : Depones, that he said that such assurance was necessary for partaking of the

A communion—that he blamed any person for partaking of the ordinance unless he had that assurance: Depones that he recollects of Mr. Campbell holding an examination in the deponent's mother's house at Easterton, in October 1829: Depones, that he remembers Mr. Campbell's explaining the nature of faith on that occasion from the question in the Shorter Catechism, "What is faith in Jesus Christ?" Depones, that Mr. Campbell's explanation was that no one can have received, or be resting upon Christ for salvation, unless he had personal assurance of his own salvation: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach on the second of May 1830: Depones, that Mr. Campbell on that occasion taught, that the sins of the whole world were forgiven through the death of Christ; and in allusion to that, said, the faith, which you are accustomed to hear preached from this place, alone has a power to work godliness in the heart. All men who have not this faith, whatever their characters in other respects may be, are alike distant from the kingdom of heaven: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row on the fourth of July 1830, and took notes: Depones, that on that occasion Mr Campbell said they who admit that Christ died for all, but that there is some distance between men and the benefits resulting from his death, are commending something that is not the gospel. Men argue against the doctrine that all are redeemed and pardoned from the state of the heathen, but they (that is, the heathen) may infer that God loves them by observing the goodness of God displayed in his works, and they will be saved just as the Jews were saved by believing in the great sacrifice afterwards to be offered up for their sins, which was shadowed forth to them in types and figures. We are claiming a real glory to God when we maintain that Christ died for all: Depones, that he was present at a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell at Row on the eighteenth of July 1830, and on that occasion Mr. Campbell said, as the deponent finds from notes which he

took, "I do not know a passage where it is insinuated that A  
 christians stand in doubt that they are in the faith:" Depones,  
 that the deponent again heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row  
 on the eighth August 1830, and took notes. That, on that  
 occasion, Mr. Campbell said, by limiting God's love men  
 have denied that there is love in God at all. He that main- B  
 tains that God loves some and passes by others, denies that  
 there is any love in God—this would not proceed from love,  
 but from caprice: Depones, that the doctrine generally  
 taught by Mr. Campbell on the subject of the pardon of  
 sin, was that all men are pardoned in the same sense: De- C  
 ponos, that he has heard Mr. Campbell preach that a min-  
 ister was bound, or entitled, to go to each individual and  
 say, your sins are forgiven: Depones, that at Mr. Campbell's  
 examination at Easterton, formerly deponed to, he, in exam-  
 ining from the Catechism, objected to the words, "Christ D  
 as he is offered to us in the gospel," and said that it ought  
 to be "given to us in the gospel," and that the use of the word  
 "offered," gave rise to misapprehension: Depones, that it  
 was usual with Mr. Campbell in his sermons to divide his  
 hearers into two classes, viz. those who had assurance of E  
 personal salvation and those who had not—and he said that  
 the one class were true christians, and the others were not:  
 Depones, that this occurred frequently: Depones, that the  
 deponent was informed by an uncle of his, now dead, that  
 in the end of September 1829, Mr. Campbell had visited F  
 him as a sick or dying person, and about a fortnight before  
 his death, and, at this visit, that Mr. Campbell said to him  
 that he was in hell, and that he was worse than a pagan,  
 because he did not see his sins pardoned.

Interrogated for the defender—in reference to the sermon G  
 on 1 Tim. i. 5, what was the faith which deponent was  
 accustomed to hear Mr. Campbell state from that place?  
 Depones, that it was the faith that Christ died for all, and  
 that their sins were pardoned, and that the Spirit was given



A in Christ to sanctify them: Depones, that deponent is sure that Mr. Campbell did not refer to the Scriptures in saying, during the examination at Easterton; that the word "given" was preferable to "offered." Being interrogated what deponent means by saying that Mr. Campbell did not refer to the B Scriptures? Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not quote any text in support of his statement: Depones, that Mr. Campbell said the word "offered" was not a Scriptural expression, and assigned that as his reason for substituting "given:" Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not commonly give any C other features of the two classes, into which he frequently divided his hearers, but that the one class had, and the other had not, an assurance of personal salvation: Depones, that deponent's uncle died in October, 1829: Depones, that in speaking of the two classes of hearers, before September, D 1830, Mr. Campbell used sometimes to talk of the fruits of faith: Depones, that he also talked of the fruits of our natural corruption and evil hearts: Depones, that deponent does not remember just now whether Mr. Campbell stated how God regarded the fruits of faith: Depones, that deponent does E not remember just now whether Mr. Campbell stated how God regarded the fruits of wicked men: Depones, that Mr. Campbell's remarks on the love of God to all men were such as appeared to deponent calculated to make men think less awfully of sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that sin F would be punished.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that he does not remember at present any observation of Mr. Campbell's, the tendency of which was to diminish our abhorrence of sin: Depones, that he thinks that it appeared from Mr. Campbell's G teaching, that the punishment of sin will be infinitely aggravated by the rejection of the gospel: Depones, that when the deponent's uncle mentioned to him the expressions above deposed to, he gave no explanation of them, and he seemed displeased with Mr. Campbell at having used them, and was

not very calm : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell A say, that the forgiveness of sins was equivalent to the removal of the barrier between God and man. And that he taught that howsoever great the sins of any man, the removal of that barrier opened up an access for him to God. And also that an access being thus opened, by the removal of the B barrier, a man had no occasion to pray for the removal of that barrier : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the access being thus opened, a sinner, believing that it was so opened, and praying to God, might expect to receive salvation : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the belief of C a sinner in the work of Christ was calculated to produce in his mind confidence of being saved : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the knowledge of the work of Christ had power to work godliness in the heart : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the design of God, in the exhibi- D tion of a crucified and risen Saviour, was to remove the iniquity of all men : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that it operated the removal of iniquity from the soul by producing a love of holiness : Depones, that when he spoke of his uncle being displeased and not very calm, he meant to E express the same state of mind in these two forms of words. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) PETER BAIN.

JOHN M'FARLANE, feuar in Helensburgh, aged about F 72, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel : Depones, that he was formerly an elder in the parish of Cardross, and that he now resides in Helensburgh : Depones, that he has attended the church of Row pretty regularly since Mr. Campbell came G there : Depones, that he was present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper at Row, in July, 1830, and heard Mr. Campbell fence the tables : Depones, that he was struck with what Mr. Campbell said in regard to assurance of salvation :

A Depones, that about the close of Mr. Campbell's address, he said that the feast was spread for the worthy communicants, and then he added that those who had the full assurance were the worthy communicants, and that those who had not such assurance would have an awful responsibility if they B partook of the ordinance, and he left their blood on their own head : Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean personal assurance of salvation : Depones, that the deponent cannot say that what is above deponed is in Mr. Campbell's precise words, but it is the substance of C what he said : Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in his ordinary sermons, taught, and generally in his application at the close, that the death of Christ was a general death for every man.

(Objection on the minor repeated.)

Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that D by the death of Christ the sins of every individual of the human race were pardoned : Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell left those who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation, in a state of condemnation : Depones, that he remembers Mr. Campbell coming to his E house in July, 1830, and on that occasion he gave the deponent's wife, who is rather frail, a copy of a sermon, which the deponent now produces, and is marked by the Moderator, and which Mr. Campbell said he had preached in the Floating Chapel at Greenock, on the twenty-eighth April : Depones, F that in consequence of what Mr. Campbell said in fencing the tables the deponent felt scruples himself about communicating, or whether he had that personal assurance which Mr. Campbell spoke of : Depones, that he officiated as an elder on that occasion, and was present when tokens were G distributed by Mr. Campbell and one Cochran, but cannot say whether he himself distributed any : Depones, that he took the sacrament on that occasion after considering with himself, and applying to himself the test mentioned by the apostle Paul, which was the deponent's standard. Interro-

gated for the defender: Depones, that the deponent is a little A  
 dull of hearing, but not very much; but rather that, which  
 is not to be wondered at at his age. Being interrogated  
 whether Mr. Campbell in fencing the tables spoke about the  
 assurance of faith? Depones, and answers that he has told  
 what he had to say already—that he has given what he had B  
 to say in plain language, and he can tax his memory no more  
 about it: Depones, that what he means by the standard of  
 the apostle Paul is what he finds in the eleventh chapter of  
 first Corinthians, and you will also find it in the gospels: C  
 Depones, that when he says that the standard of the apostle  
 Paul is in the eleventh chapter of first Corinthians, that the  
 deponent refers to the twenty-eighth verse of that chapter: D  
 Depones, that deponent does not recollect and will not swear  
 whether Mr. Campbell forbade or commanded people to ex-  
 amine themselves on that occasion. Being interrogated whe-  
 ther deponent remembers that, in spring 1830, Mr. Campbell  
 spoke from the pulpit about people having taken him up wrong  
 as to the meaning of the word “pardon?” Depones, that  
 he does not: Depones, that deponent does not remember to  
 have spoken to any one in coming home from church on a E  
 Sunday in spring 1830, regarding the meaning attached by  
 Mr. Campbell to the word “pardon.”

Interrogated by Mr. Story wherein he considered Mr. Camp-  
 bell's test to differ from the apostle Paul's? Depones, that there  
 was a difference, and that he judged for himself—and the de- F  
 ponent was never a great explainer of scripture, but just takes  
 the Bible and judges for himself. Interrogated whether Mr.  
 Campbell gave any particular instructions to his elders as to the  
 distribution of tokens? Depones, that he never heard of a mi-  
 nister doing so when persons produced proper certificates, and G  
 that Mr. Campbell did not do so on this occasion, as far as the  
 deponent understood: Depones, that he does not recollect of  
 Mr. Campbell ever expressing to the deponent any doubt of  
 the fitness of any particular individual to be a communicant:

A Depones, that the deponent's understanding of Mr. Campbell's doctrine about assurance did not make him hesitate about giving tokens to any particular individual, but he does not recollect whether after hearing that doctrine he gave any tokens, although he would not have refused them if they had been asked. And the above is truth, as he shall answer to God.

(Signed) JOHN M'FARLANE.

REV. JOHN ARTHUR, residing in Helensburgh, aged thirty-five years, and unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row in July last on the occasion of the Presbyterial visitation: Depones, that he took no notes of the sermon: Depones, that it did not appear to him that the subject of pardon was prominently or directly brought forward: Depones, that he recollects Mr. Campbell using such words as these, "that the love of God to every individual of Adam's family was to be measured by the agonies of the Son of God:" Depones, that in that sermon, Jesus, as the forerunner of his people, was described as the great peace-maker: Depones, that he said that those men were peace-makers who were reconciled unto God: Depones, that he does not recollect Mr. Campbell saying any thing of persons knowing that Christ died for themselves, individually, or for every human being, in connexion with the character of peace-maker; but he recollects him saying, in substance, that we ought to imitate Christ, our head, in being peace-makers: Depones, that deponent did not on any other occasion within the year libelled hear Mr. Campbell preach. All which is truth, as he shall answer to God.

G (Signed) JOHN ARTHUR.

ALEXANDER MUNRO, now, or lately, tutor in the family of Lord John Campbell, Ardincaple-house, near Helensburgh, aged about thirty-four, and unmarried, being solemnly

sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel : A  
 Depones, that he is a preacher of the gospel, and has been so  
 for about a twelvemonth : Depones, that he resided in the  
 parish of Row from July 1829 to July 1830, after which he  
 was absent about two or three months : Depones, that between  
 September 1829 and the beginning of July 1830, the depo- B  
 nent was in the habit of attending Mr. Campbell's church  
 about once in three Sundays or thereabouts : Depones, that  
 it struck him that Mr. Campbell's doctrines were peculiar,  
 and different from those of the standards of our church, in  
 regard to the atonement, and assurance of salvation.

Objection against Mr. Brewster and Dr. Burns repeated. C

Depones, that the deponent was not in the habit of taking  
 notes : Depones, that the deponent heard Mr. Campbell  
 preach before the Presbytery in July, 1830 : Depones, that  
 he does not remember that there was any thing in that ser- D  
 mon on the subject of assurance, but there was a sprinkling,  
 in different parts of the sermon, of Mr. Campbell's peculiar  
 views of atonement, and the pardon of sin : Depones, that  
 it did not appear to the deponent that this formed the pro-  
 per subject of the discourse : Depones, that he thinks Mr. E  
 Campbell's peculiar doctrines, in regard to pardon, were less  
 prominently brought forward in that sermon than the depo-  
 nent has heard them ; but at the same time he does not  
 think they were avoided : Depones, that on this occasion,  
 the deponent conceives that Mr. Campbell taught that the F  
 atonement of Christ was made for all men : Depones, that  
 towards the end of the discourse, Mr. Campbell expressed  
 the following sentiment in substance—that the love of God  
 to man was commensurate with the agonies of the Son of God  
 —and that any one preaching the gospel to men, could not G  
 proclaim it to them as glad tidings, unless he could inform  
 them that they were put by it in a certain state—by their  
 being reconciled unto God, and their sins being pardoned—  
 whether they knew it or not : Depones, that he does not

A remember Mr. Campbell saying that it was an indispensable feature in the character of a Christian, that he should know that God has had mercy on him, and has forgiven him : Depones, that it appeared to him that the doctrine taught by Mr. Campbell, in his sermons, generally, in regard to the atone-  
 B ment, was different from that of the Church, in the first place, as respects the extent of the atonement : Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that the merits of Christ's death were co-extensive with the sins of all men : Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the par-  
 C don of sin, in consequence of the death of Christ, was not offered to all men—that it was not an offer, but a gift, put into their possession : Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell, in saying this, to mean that this pardon had passed upon all men, without exception, or distinction ; and  
 D upon the heathen who did not know it, as well as upon others : Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that those who had passed from death unto life, must be assured of it ; and that they could not be in a state of sal-  
 E vation, unless they were so assured : Depones, that he re- members Mr. Campbell illustrating this doctrine by observing that a soldier who passed over from the rebellious ranks, and returned to loyalty, must know the time when he did so, and could not be ignorant of his having done so.

Interrogated for the defender : Depones, that the situa-  
 F tion in which Mr. Campbell stated that the preacher should tell all men that they were placed, in consequence of the death of Christ, was, that God had had mercy on them, and had forgiven their sins : Depones, that the deponent under- stood Mr. Campbell to state, that the design of God in com-  
 G missioning his preachers to tell all men that he had had mercy on them, and had forgiven their sins, was to bring heirs to glory—to exhibit his love to his creatures, and to draw men to himself. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell stated was the condition from which God thus designed to draw

men to himself? Depones, not the state of condemnation cer- A  
 tainly—for they were not in a state of condemnation—at  
 least this is the inference of the witness. And the deponent  
 cannot well say what Mr. Campbell taught on this matter :  
 Depones, that the deponent has frequently heard Mr. Camp-  
 bell speak of the state of the hearts of unbelievers towards B  
 God : Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to say, that  
 that state was, that they were not aware of the state of pardon  
 in which they were, and of the gift put into their possession,  
 and this ignorance prevented them from being sanctified : De-  
 ponos, that deponent has certainly heard Mr. Campbell charac- C  
 terise them as in a state of rebellion against God : Depones,  
 that Mr. Campbell described God as hating iniquity ; but  
 not as hating sinners : Depones, that deponent did not un-  
 derstand Mr. Campbell to teach that men were condemned as  
 sinners, but as unbelievers, and that God did not hate or con- D  
 demn them as sinners, but condemned them as unbelievers.  
 Being interrogated if Mr. Campbell ever taught that God  
 hated unbelievers ? Depones, that deponent cannot remem-  
 ber to have heard the word “ hate,” applied to unbelievers ;  
 but remembers to have heard the word “ condemn,” so ap- E  
 plied : Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that unbelief pro-  
 ceeded from the depravity inherent in our nature, modified  
 by all the various minor causes which may proceed from  
 that great cause. That deponent did not perceive any thing  
 peculiar in Mr. Campbell’s mode of accounting for unbelief, F  
 except that he dwelt less upon the Spirit’s influence, and  
 more upon the operation of man’s own mind, in producing  
 the first act of belief, than the deponent considered consis-  
 tent with the standards. Being interrogated whether Mr.  
 Campbell taught that any man could be believing truly in the G  
 forgiveness of his sins, and yet continuing in wickedness ?  
 Depones, that Mr. Campbell’s doctrine was, that if a man  
 truly believed that his sins were forgiven, he had eternal life  
 in him, and would ultimately enjoy it, as he held also the



- A** doctrine of perseverance, which implied that : Depones, that the method by which Mr. Campbell stated that a man could come to God was, by believing the Record, which, as Mr. Campbell frequently explained it, the deponent understood to mean believing that his own sins, as well as the sins of
- B** every other man, had been already pardoned : Depones, that when Mr. Campbell referred to the Record, deponent understood him to refer particularly to 1 John v. 11 : Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to make eternal life consist in a variety of things, and his definitions seemed to
- C** the deponent to be loose and inconsistent, and that he transposed the expression eternal life, from one set of ideas to another : Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that eternal life consisted, not merely in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, whom he had sent, but in the gift of Christ and his
- D** dwelling in us : Depones, that another view of eternal life, given by Mr. Campbell, which the deponent considered as different from that usually given, was, that he stated that in having given to all men Christ, and as eternal life consisted in having Christ given ; therefore, all men had eternal
- E** life given them, but he did not always appear to the deponent, by the expression, eternal life, to mean everlasting happiness, but something else—but the deponent does not know precisely what ; although he sometimes seemed to the deponent to make eternal happiness and holiness to
- F** be included in his idea of eternal life. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men possessed in them Christ and the life of God ? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that all men have in them the gift of Christ, understanding, as Mr. Campbell often explained it, by that the
- G** pardon of their sins : That the deponent does not precisely know what may be meant in this question by the expression “the life of God,” which he thinks may have various meanings : But deponent adds that he did not understand Mr. Campbell to teach the Arminian doctrine that all men had a

portion of grace given them to improve, if that sense be attached to the phrase "the life of God:" Depones, that deponent does not remember Mr. Campbell to have taught that all men have Christ dwelling in them by the Holy Ghost. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that any man could be alive unto God except by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost? Depones, that understanding the phrase "alive to God" to mean "the state into which a man passes when by the knowledge of the gospel, blessed by the influence of the Holy Spirit, he becomes justified in the sight of God," that he does not conceive that Mr. Campbell taught that in this sense a man could be "alive to God," except by the influence of the Holy Spirit; but, as the deponent formerly said, Mr. Campbell did not seem to insist much on the necessity of the Spirit's influence in producing the first act of belief, but rather that the influence of the Spirit was a consequent of the first act of belief—although deponent does not deny that Mr. Campbell may have taught that the Spirit's influence operated to produce the first act of belief: Depones, that Mr. Campbell seemed to hold that men were active in unbelief, but rather passive in belief: Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell state that a man could know the gospel without being blessed by the influences of the Spirit: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that if a man knew the gospel, the influences of the Spirit must flow into his mind—understanding by the gospel the pardon of his sins: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell's view of the matter, in saying that a believer was rather passive than active in believing, to be that unbelievers resisted and put away from them the gospel, and that if they would only cease their resistance the gospel would flow into them. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that those who had passed from death to life could never, for any time, however short, cease to be assured of their personal salvation? Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell admit that there might be times when,

A through the temptations of Satan, obscurity might rest on the believer's mind—but still there was always something which kept up the idea of assurance of his state—though the deponent confesses that it was always inexplaining that something, that Mr. Campbell seemed to the deponent to find the greatest difficulty, and which was never intelligible to the deponent.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the knowledge of the gospel commenced a sanctifying process in the mind of the believer—and the deponent also understood Mr. Campbell to teach that this sanctifying process terminated in perfect holiness only in the next world: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that God was dissatisfied with the acts and state of a sinner, but not at enmity with the sinner himself: Depones, that Mr. Campbell in applying the word redemption to all men, and to each man, sometimes made it synonymous with atonement, or satisfaction, as applied to all men, and sometimes in the particular sense of the final salvation of an individual sinner: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in varying the ordinary forms of speech, seemed to be anxious to do away with the delusions of people in supposing that they had something to do in order to propitiate the love of God, and that he dwelt much upon this; but the deponent adds that Mr. Campbell seemed to him on one or two occasions, to teach that the sufferings and toils of saints were necessary to follow on the death of Christ, seeming, as it were, to imply that they were necessary to complete the atonement of Christ—but in general he was not struck with any thing peculiar in Mr. Campbell's doctrine regarding the sufferings of saints: Depones, that in saying he conceived that Mr. Campbell's views on the subject of assurance of salvation were different from the views stated in the standards of our church, he alluded to the eighteenth chapter of the Confession of Faith, and he thought Mr. Campbell's doctrine to be inconsistent with

the third section of that chapter : Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach that when a believer was under the influence of the temptations of Satan an obscurity might come over his mind, but still there was a something formerly alluded to by the deponent, of the nature of assurance, which remained. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God. A B

(Signed) ALEX. MUNRO.

The following witnesses were then examined for the defender, viz. C

MR. HERVEY STRONG, sometime residing in Glasgow, now in Helensburgh, aged about thirty-eight, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel : Depones, that deponent resided in Helensburgh between August, 1829, and October, 1830, and attended the parish church very regularly : Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell preach also in the school-house at Helensburgh, and in the manse. D

Depones, that in September or October, 1829, deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach in the school-house of Helensburgh on the text "Is there no balm in Gilead?" Depones, that Mr. Campbell on that occasion brought out his doctrine on the subject of atonement and pardon, which deponent always held to be one and the same ; but the deponent has no distinct recollection of the words used by Mr. Campbell, or whether he preached on that occasion, on the doctrine of assurance : Depones, that the object of Mr. Campbell's discourse was to illustrate the freeness of the gospel, and the fulness of the atonement : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught at that time, as at all times, that the atonement was literally G for every man, and that Christ died for every man : Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that there were two classes of human beings, the one in enmity and distrust towards God, the other in confidence and love towards him ; which statements F

- A accorded with Mr. Campbell's general teaching: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that every man was by nature in a state of enmity to God, and that he required to be brought out of that state in order to be in a state of salvation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that the love of God in
- B Christ, manifested on the cross, was that which, when apprehended by any man as applicable to himself, brought him, by appropriating Christ to himself, out of the one state into the other—that then his enmity and distrust ceased, and his confidence and love commenced: Depones, that Mr. Camp-
- C bell stated that the love of God manifested in the cross, as a love to the individual, was the light through which he could see sin, and that light alone; that it was a light by which he could perceive the abominable nature of sin;—that God's love in the heart, which can only come there by an appropriating
- D act of faith, is light and life—it is the Spirit of Christ in him. He sees sin then as Christ saw it; that no man can have any correct notion of sin at all, or see sin in its true character, unless by the light of the gospel: Depones, that deponent did not understand Mr. Campbell to teach that night that a be-
- E lief that one's sins are pardoned was the only feature of a christian character: But Mr. Campbell held that a man's belief that his own sins are forgiven is essential to his being a christian, and that he has no life till he has that in his heart.
- Depones, that, although deponent does not recollect that
- F Mr. Campbell did so on that night, he knows that Mr. Campbell always held forth that mere seriousness is nothing, that seriousness is no excuse for being in error: Depones, that when Mr. Campbell so used the word seriousness, he understood him to refer to a seriousness which might consist with
- G a misapprehension of God's character—that a man might be serious with the idea that he was under the law of works, and might desire to do good works, but that that was no apology, but, on the contrary, it was his condemnation that he had not the light: That Mr. Campbell never undervalued

seriousness in the right apprehension of the truth: That Mr. A Campbell illustrated his position by reference to the earnestness with which heathens may worship; that a heathen may be as serious in the wrong apprehension of God as if he had had the right apprehension of God: Depones, that deponent is perfectly sure that if he had heard Mr. Campbell condemn- B ing any seriousness but such as above described he would have noticed it.

Depones, that on the night above alluded to deponent did not hear Mr. Campbell speak of unbelief as the only cause of sorrow, and is confident that had he heard it he would C have marked it: Deponent has always heard Mr. Campbell teach that sin was the only cause of sorrow in believers, and that unbelievers could have no right sorrow for sin—that they might have an imitation of sorrow for sin, because they might come into punishment, but that was no right sorrow for sin, D and it was a sin to be in a state to have that sorrow merely; that the right sorrow was a sorrow for sin as sinning against love, and as seeing sin as a hateful thing in itself, offensive to God, and offensive to that spirit which is in a christian; that a christian had the mind of Christ, and looked upon sin with E that kind of sorrow which Christ had: That deponent never understood Mr. Campbell to state thereby that Christ had sorrow for his own sin, for he never heard Mr. Campbell state that Christ had sin—on the contrary he always held that Christ was without sin; that the sorrow which believers had for sin F was a sorrow for all sin, in themselves, and in every other creature.

Depones, that he has often heard Mr. Campbell teach and preach concerning an interest in Christ—meaning that every man has an interest in Christ; that Christ was the gift of G God to the world; that the sense in which Mr. Campbell said that every man had an interest in Christ was this, that every man had a right to take—to possess—to appropriate him, and it was every man's sin to whom the gospel was

A preached that he did not : Depones, that when Mr. Campbell spoke of taking, or appropriating Christ, and of believing the record which God has given of his Son, deponent understood him to mean the same thing—that a man apprehending the gospel rightly does receive and appropriate Christ as his Saviour : Depones, that God has made a provision of strength for every man to live in the truth of the gospel : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the Holy Ghost took of the things of the gospel and shewed them to the man's soul; and that this strength was to be had in answer to prayer.

C Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell teach that a man could be a true believer merely by believing that his sins were forgiven, unless he saw how they were forgiven—that there was no power to sanctify in the mere belief that one's sins were forgiven, unless more than that was seen. Being interrogated, whether if, on the evening above alluded to, Mr. Campbell had stated that a sense of guilt and unworthiness had no connexion with believing, it would have struck deponent? Depones and answers, certainly, he could not have stated it without the deponent's noticing it—E because it would have been perfectly contrary to what Mr. Campbell has always taught on that subject, viz. that a man cannot have that sense unless he is a believer : Depones, that, although deponent does not remember whether Mr. Campbell spoke, that night, of an anxiety about salvation without a F true sense of sin, yet deponent has heard Mr. Campbell on the subject, say, that a man's anxiety may imply unbelief.

Being interrogated whether the view given by Mr. Campbell that night of the love of God, appeared to deponent to have a tendency to make men easy about sin? Depones and G answers, that he never heard Mr. Campbell, on that night, or on any occasion within the time libelled, preach any doctrine which had a tendency to licentiousness—unless the free grace—the free love, and the free forgiveness of God have that tendency.

Depones, that he did not, on that night, hear Mr. Campbell **A** ~~bell~~ preach that the cause of the whole of man's misery was their allowing themselves to remain in doubt regarding the simple fact of their having been individually restored to a state of favour with God—and that he thinks he should have noticed it, had Mr. Campbell so preached, because it was **B** not like a statement of Mr. Campbell's at all.

Depones, that deponent heard nothing in the sermon above deponed to, in the school-house at Helensburgh, which at the time appeared to deponent to militate against the Scriptures, which state that men shall be judged for the deeds **C** done in the body: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has, during the year libelled, always represented the ground of condemnation at the last day to be unbelief, or the rejection of Christ—that unbelief, or the rejection of Christ, proceeded from the evil heart of man—that that evil heart made man **D** unwilling to come to Christ—that the evil heart was to be referred to the fall of man in Adam—that the wicked deeds of men were to be referred to their love of evil: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not represent unbelief as the only sin under the gospel dispensation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell **E** associated judgment for the deeds done in the body with condemnation for unbelief, by stating that God's judgment would be according to righteousness, and that a man must be righteous, or have the Spirit of Christ, otherwise he would be condemned—that Mr. Campbell said, that having God's **F** love in the heart, was the having the Spirit of Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell was in the habit of teaching the connexion between being righteous and having the mind of Christ—and illustrated that connexion by stating that one that had the mind of Christ was one who apprehended the **G** love of God in Christ to him; and that the love of God in the heart was holiness, or having the Spirit of Christ. Interrogated—to what power Mr. Campbell referred the righteous deeds of believers? Depones and answers, the love of God



- A** in the heart was the operating power: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the love of God was sustained in the heart of man by the strength of the Holy Ghost: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, on the evening deponed to, pressed the acceptance of the gospel upon his hearers: Depones, that
- B** Mr. Campbell, on that evening, as always, represented God as a sin-avenging God.

- Depones, that Mr. Campbell constantly, during the year libelled, gave a view of God's justice in punishing unbelievers at the last day—and adds, it is a prominent feature of his
- C** discourses, exhibiting to his hearers the wrath of God towards those who reject Christ—and is a common expression with him “Knowing the terrors of the Lord we persuade men:” Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell, during the time libelled, treat of the redemption of all men
- D** by Christ: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell thereby to mean, redeemed from the curse—taken from under the law, or the law of works, and placed under grace: Depones, that deponent understood that it did not include deliverance from the judgment to come.
- E** Depones, that deponent was a communicant at the sacrament, in July, 1830: Depones, was at the second or third table—a table which Mr. Campbell addressed—and heard Mr. Campbell fence the tables on that day: Depones, that both in the previous discourse, and in the fencing of the
- F** tables, Mr. Campbell treated of the way in which believers might eat and drink damnation or judgment to themselves—that deponent understood this to mean, much as Mr. Campbell explained it, and very nearly in his own words—that a believer might eat and drink damnation to himself by not
- G** abiding in the faith at the time; and if he did not discern the Lord's body: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell thereby to refer to temporal judgment—that Mr. Campbell stated, that a Christian was not abiding in the faith at the time, or discerning the Lord's body, if he did not dis-

cern, and realize at the time, that the body was broken and A  
 the blood shed for him; of which things the bread and wine  
 were symbols. Being interrogated, whether on occasion of  
 so fencing the tables, deponent heard Mr. Campbell debar  
 from the Lord's Supper all who had not a personal assurance  
 of their own salvation? Depones, and answers—nothing of B  
 the kind—I heard no debarring but what was implied in the  
 above explanation of eating and drinking judgment—that  
 they were in that *warned*: Depones, that Mr. Campbell  
 forbade nobody, and deponent watched narrowly, for he had  
 heard that Mr. Campbell had been accused of doing so on C  
 former sacramental occasions.

Depones, that deponent has often heard Mr. Campbell, in  
 his public prayers, praying for the pardon of sins—and never  
 heard him pray without it.

Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach and D  
 preach concerning the doctrine of assurance. That he  
 divided assurance into assurance of faith and assurance of  
 sense—and did so frequently: Depones, that he defined  
 assurance of faith to be, that a man who had a right appre-  
 hension of the gospel was, while abiding in that right appre- E  
 hension, conscious of his own salvation as being a child of  
 God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell defined the assurance of  
 sense to be, the consequence of a right faith—the Spirit's  
 witnessing with his spirit, that he was a child of God:  
 Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of F  
 faith above defined was capable of interruption, for it was  
 always guarded with the "while abiding in the faith:"  
 Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the absence of that  
 assurance was sinful in every man: Depones, that Mr.  
 Campbell taught that whoever had not the assurance of faith G  
 was not believing the record of God, or had not that record  
 in his mind at the time: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught  
 that if a man was without the consciousness of the Bible  
 at the time on his mind, it was to him as being without

**A** the Bible, as he was not under the influence of it at the time.

Depones, that deponent was present at Mr. Campbell's visitation sermon in July 1830, of which the leading subject was the beatitudes: Depones, that Mr. Campbell then **B** preached that a believer was in the partial enjoyment of the beatitudes in this life, and would have the full enjoyment of them in the future life: Depones, that deponent observed no difference between Mr. Campbell's sermon on that occasion and his ordinary sermons about that time in point of **C** doctrine.

Interrogated for the libellers: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the pardon of sins through the death of Christ was universal, and extended to the sins of all men, and the pardon was for all men—by which Mr. Campbell **D** meant, as the deponent understood, that the sins of every man were judicially removed, so that it was no reason why a man should not, and might not, come to God, and that unless the sins of the world had been so put away, God could not, consistently with his holiness, invite or command **E** any man to come to him—that every man, in consequence of the death of Christ, not only had a right to come, but his not coming was his highest condemnation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the sins of every individual of the human race were, in point of fact, forgiven, in the sense **F** above explained, and not merely that they would be forgiven if they came to Christ: and that Mr. Campbell never taught in that form that their sins would be forgiven, but that they were forgiven: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man cannot believe savingly unless he sees that his own **G** individual sins are forgiven.

Depones, that deponent conceives that Mr. Campbell, in praying for the pardon of sin, did not pray for forgiveness as the reversal of the sentence of eternal wrath—but deliverance from temporal chastisements or judgments: Depones,

that he considered that Mr. Campbell, in so praying for deliverance from temporal chastisements, or judgments, prayed for the pardon of sin: Depones, that it seems to the deponent that the parable in the gospel of Matthew of a certain king who forgave a servant ten thousand talents, and afterwards delivered him over to the tormentors—that that servant represents man and the relation in which man stands to God in the day of grace—that that servant after having been forgiven might rightly have prayed for forgiveness for any departure from righteous conduct—that in praying he was acknowledging, or putting to his seal, that it would be a righteous thing to deliver him over to the tormentors, if he was not found, on the day of reckoning, to have been acting in the Spirit, towards his fellow men, in which he had been dealt with by his King, and his prayer might have been, “forgive me, or acquit me, as I have been found dealing with others.” D

Depones, that when Mr. Campbell stated that in consequence of the death of Christ all sins were forgiven, the deponent understood him to teach that all sins without exception, unbelief as well as others, were forgiven in consequence of the death of Christ, and that this was the proclamation of the gospel, and that there was no farther atonement for sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that every man, whether he has heard of the gospel or not, is exposed to the wrath of God, but not to the curse of the law in consequence of sin either original or actual: Depones, F that the deponent considers the difference between being exposed to the wrath of God and exposed to the curse of the law, to be, that the state of the soul of the unbeliever towards God is that of being under the law of works—that all men are taken from under the law—but believers keep G themselves in that state—that the deponent is not sure whether this observation is his own idea or derived from Mr. Campbell's teaching: Depones, that the deponent sees no inconsistency between his answers to the two last ques-

- A** tions: Depones, that the sins of a man who has never heard of the gospel are as much atoned for as the sins of a man who has heard of it, and believed: and that a man's sins are not atoned for because he believes: Depones, that Mr. Campbell in praying, as above deponed to, for the pardon
- B** of sin, always prayed for deliverance from temporal chastisements or judgments, as being the forgiveness of sins, and not for a reversal of the sentence of eternal wrath—and the deponent cannot understand that any christian can pray for forgiveness as the reversal of the sentence of eternal wrath—
- C** because our Lord and Saviour told his beloved disciples, who were pardoned persons, and who knew that they were delivered from the sentence of eternal wrath, and could not fall under eternal condemnation, to pray for forgiveness, and that *they* could not pray for forgiveness as the reversal of
- D** eternal wrath, for they knew they were delivered from the possibility of coming under it—they had eternal life, which they could never lose—and this last is the deponent's own idea—although he will not say that he may not have come to it by Mr. Campbell's teaching: Depones, that the de-
- E** ponent in speaking of a man being conscious of his own salvation, meant that he had no doubt of it, and was certain of it. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man could not be a christian if he doubted of his own salvation? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught
- F** that a christian might fall into such darkness as to doubt whether the Bible was the word of God—and still be a Christian while he so doubted, because once a Christian, always a Christian, and he cannot fall off—but in this state he is not exhibiting the character of a Christian.
- G** Reinterrogated for the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell never taught that there were any men whom the gospel did not concern: Depones, that in regard to the heathen, Mr. Campbell taught that every thing they enjoyed—the light of the sun, and the rain from heaven, was an

expression of God's goodness and love towards them—**A** and that it was owing to the death of Christ that these benefits flowed to them: Depones, that the confession of sin, and prayer for deliverance from evil, constituted a prominent feature of Mr. Campbell's public prayers: Depones, that deponent never understood Mr. Campbell to state, or to **B** imply, that it would be a right thing in a believer, to suppose himself an heir of eternal wrath: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a believer must believe himself possessed of an inheritance, and that he had the earnest of the inheritance of the saints: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a **C** believer could not, at the time, be exhibiting the character of a believer, if he did not believe that he had the inheritance of the saints.

Interrogated by Mr. Carr: Depones, that the way in which Mr. Campbell expressed himself in making confession **D** of sins in his public prayers, was by saying, that we were justly deserving of condemnation, and unworthy of the least of God's mercies—and this was one of many forms of confession: Depones, that deploring sin, and confessing sin, and imploring deliverance from sin, formed the burden of **E** Mr. Campbell's public prayers.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell, in saying, that men would be condemned for unbelief, to mean, that they would be condemned for rejecting Christ, and for denying the position **F** that Christ died for their sins, and that in rejecting Christ, any one was trampling under foot the Son of God, and counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and not sufficient for his salvation—that his remaining, or being found in a state of unrighteousness, was the consequence of his **G** rejecting Christ—Christ was a provision of deliverance from an unholy state.

Being interrogated whether when Mr. Campbell said that a believer in communicating unworthily, ate and drank dam-

**A** nation to himself, deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean, that faith was destroyed in principle, or merely suspended in its actings: Depones, it was suspended in action: Depones, that in the visitation sermon, Mr. Campbell stated, in substance, that the measure of the love of God to every **B** individual was expressed in the agonies of Christ, and that was what he always preached.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that God is pleading with every human being to turn to him and live. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach **C** regarding the desire of God, that men should pray to him? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that it is the desire of God that men should pray to him, and that they are commanded to seek the Spirit: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man cannot pray acceptably to God, while **D** totally ignorant of God. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the forgiveness of sins or the atonement, as expressive of this desire in the mind of God, that all men should pray to him? Depones, that they should seek deliverance from sin. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught, **E** or did not teach, that every prayer proceeding from a believer, of necessity implies the knowledge of its being well pleasing to God? Depones, and answers, certainly—that the life of a Christian is prayer. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the connexion of prayer with the **F** enjoyment of this life? Depones and answers—that prayer is communion with God, and life to the soul. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the solemn mockery of a believer praying, that he may have liberty of access to him? Depones and answers—that Mr. Campbell taught that **G** a real believer cannot pray for liberty of access, because he cannot be a real believer if he prays for liberty of access to God. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the origin of all temporal sufferings? Depones and answers—that the origin is man's departure from God. Inter-

rogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach is the end or object A of these sufferings? Depones and answers—to bring men back to God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach that believing the gospel delivers men from temporal sufferings: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the temporal chastisements of believers teach them that they are sinners. B Interrogated, did Mr. Campbell teach that a believer has any reason to expect that God his Father, will remove from him those chastisements inflicted on account of his sins, unless he confess those sins in the knowledge of God being just to forgive him his sins? Depones and answers—no, he must be C in the knowledge that God is just to forgive him his sins. Interrogated, did Mr. Campbell teach what the believer, knowing that God is just to forgive him his sins, and to cleanse him from all unrighteousness, is to do? Depones and answers—to seek in prayer to be delivered and cleansed. D Interrogated, how it is that the deponent said formerly, that unbelief is forgiven as well as other sins? Depones and answers—that all sins are atoned for, and there is no more atonement, and if that sin is not atoned for, no man can be saved, because every man has been an unbeliever—and the E deponent understands that to have been Mr. Campbell's teaching. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of faith and the assurance of sense, were always co-existing? Depones and answers—that he cannot say that he taught that, but the deponent would infer that F—that he never heard him explain it particularly in that form. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the second assurance alluded to, originated from the first? Depones and answers, certainly.

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton: Did Mr. Campbell teach G that the assurance of salvation was simultaneous with the assurance of faith? Depones and answers—that he taught that the assurance of faith precedes the assurance of sense, and consequently cannot be simultaneous with it. Interro-



**A** gated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of salvation is inseparable from the assurance of faith? Depones and answers—that Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of salvation certainly is inseparable from the assurance of faith. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding **B** the manner in which a Christian may arrive at the assurance of his own salvation? Depones and answers—that a Christian is conscious of life, and thereby knows that his faith is right. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the evidences of grace, and as to whether self-examination was necessary by a Christian to ascertain his own state of salvation? Depones and answers—that he is conscious of it, and therefore knows it without examination. Interrogated, whether did Mr. Campbell teach that it was a right or a wrong thing for a man to examine himself, in order to **D** ascertain whether he was in a state of salvation? Depones and answers—that Mr. Campbell taught that it was a right thing for a Christian to examine himself, and to be watchful over himself, but not in order to ascertain his being in a state of salvation, because a man could not be alive and not know **E** it. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) HERVEY STRONG.

JAMES WHITSHED HAWKINS, Esq. Advocate, residing in No. 21, Charlotte square, St. George's parish, Edinburgh, **F** aged 35, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice, and partial counsel: Depones, that the deponent knows the defender, and has frequently heard him preach, and otherwise express his religious doctrines, within the time libelled: Depones, that deponent first heard a **G** vate exposition by Mr. Campbell in Edinburgh, in December, 1829, or January, 1830, and heard Mr. Campbell preach, for the first time, on an occasional visit to Helensburgh, in the end of May, or beginning of June, 1830: Depones, that deponent and his family came to Helensburgh about the 5th

July, 1830, and remained till after the communion Sabbath. A That during that time Mr. Campbell besides preaching twice on the Sabbath, either in his own parish or in the neighbourhood, expounded on Wednesday, or Wednesday evenings, and preached on Thursday forenoons, in his own parish: Depones, that deponent is not aware of having missed any B sermon or exposition during that time, except on one occasion, when he did not hear the whole of an exposition.

Depones, that deponent felt perfectly satisfied, from attending Mr. Campbell's teaching on the occasions above mentioned, that Mr. Campbell taught that the death of Christ, as C a sacrifice, was for all men, without distinction: Depones, that deponent always understood from Mr. Campbell's teaching, that the death of Christ was a manifestation of the love of God to all men: Depones, that this manifestation of the love of God to all men, certainly did not appear, from Mr. D Campbell's teaching, to indicate any toleration of iniquity in the mind of God;—meaning by toleration not *forbearance*, but *countenance*, *indifference*, or *approbation*: Depones, that Mr. Campbell was in the habit of teaching, that men were to find the greatest manifestation of God's hatred against sin in E the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. Being interrogated, what Mr. Campbell taught to have been the intention of God in giving his Son? Depones and answers—I always understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that God gave his Son to die, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto F God,—meaning by the word “us” all mankind—speaking of the moral and honest intention displayed in the work, without any reference to secret purposes. Being interrogated, what deponent understands when he speaks of secret purposes, in reference to Mr. Campbell's teaching? Depones G and answers, I always understood Mr. Campbell perfectly to recognise the election of God the Father. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell spoke of that election as an eternal purpose, or as a purpose originated in time? Depones

- A** and answers—as an eternal purpose. Being interrogated, what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach regarding the relation between the election of God the Father, and the coming of any man to him in Christ? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach that God had a desire
- B** and will that all men should be saved—that as a manifestation of that desire, he had opened up a way of access to himself, by which he desired all to come to him—that God had also removed the barrier—the barrier which the holiness of God interposed to the access of the sinner to God—and
- C** that, not by laying aside his holiness, but by a work which enabled him, consistently with his holiness, to receive the vilest sinner who came to him through the access which he had himself opened up. Being interrogated, whether any but the elect of God the Father could thus come to God
- D** through Christ? Depones and answers, I always understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that, in point of fact, none but the elect would ever come to God; but that the condemnation was that men would not come to him, notwithstanding of what he had done for them to induce them to come.
- E** Depones, that the deponent has frequently heard Mr. Campbell use the words forgiveness and pardon in his preaching, which deponent supposes were used as synonymous. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were forgiven or pardoned? Depones and answers, I have heard Mr.
- F** Campbell teach that the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ hath procured forgiveness for all men—that this doctrine was not always the prominent subject of his teaching, but that when he treated it, he so expressed himself. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that this forgive-
- G** ness or pardon of all men, was a deliverance from judgment to come? Depones and answers, certainly not. Being interrogated what then Mr. Campbell taught that it was? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that, during the day of grace, it was a non-imputation of trespasses—the

sacrifice of Christ putting the sinner in the condition, and giving him the privilege of coming to God as his reconciled Father in Jesus Christ. Being interrogated to what power, work, or operation, Mr. Campbell referred a man's coming to God in Christ? Depones and answers, to the work of the Holy Spirit in bringing home the testimony of God in the gospel to the heart of the sinner. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that any man ever received that testimony but by the Holy Ghost? Depones and answers, I understood him to teach, that while, in point of fact, no one ever did receive that testimony otherwise than by the Holy Ghost, there was no physical impossibility in a man's believing *any one* testimony, who could believe *another* testimony; and that the condemnation of men was, that they *received the witness of men*, and *rejected that of God*, which is greater.

Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teaching D concerning the ground on which the judgment to come would proceed. Being interrogated by whom Mr. Campbell stated that that judgment would be executed? Depones and answers, by the Son of God; who having, as our brother, fulfilled the law of God, and purchased us with his blood, has a right to reign over us, and to judge us. Being interrogated, what Mr. Campbell taught would be the ground or principle of that judgment? Depones and answers, it is as those to whom God has shewn mercy, that we shall be judged. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that men F would, or would not be judged according to their deeds, by Christ? Depones and answers, he taught that men shall certainly be judged by their works—but according to the gospel, and not according to the law. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that the sin of unbelief was the G only sin which would be judged? Depones and answers, he taught that the actual condition of men, in the day of judgment, would be the result of their believing or not believing the gospel. That those, therefore, who will be condemned,

**A** will be condemned for unbelief. Being ~~inter~~rogated, whether, when Mr. Campbell taught that all sins were forgiven through the sacrifice of Christ, deponent understood him to include the sin of unbelief? Depones and answers, that unbelief, during the day of grace—that is, every repeated act of unbelief **B** was forgiven, as well as any other sin ;—but that the condition of the sinner, at the expiry of the day of grace, if not found prepared for God's judgment in righteousness, would expose him to that wrath of God which is revealed against all unrighteousness of men—and this for the reason that the manifestation of God's forgiving love, during the day of grace, **C** was never contemplated by God to place the sinner out of his judgment, but to prepare him for it.

Being interrogated whether deponent understood, or did not understand, that the view given by Mr. Campbell, in his **D** teaching, of the love of God, was one calculated to make men easy in sin? Depones and answers, never. And he taught, that the reason why a man will not believe the love of God is, that he would keep his sin. Being interrogated whether or not Mr Campbell taught that a knowledge of the character of God was essential to a belief in the forgiveness of sins? **E** Depones and answers, most undoubtedly he did so teach, and that no man would believe in the forgiveness of his sins who did not see the righteousness of God in the forgiveness of his sins—and consequently that no one could receive the remission of sins, except by believing in Jesus Christ. **F**

Being interrogated, whether deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach concerning seriousness, anxiety, and a sense of sin? Depones and answers, that in reference particularly to this question, deponent would state, that from having not only **G** heard Mr. Campbell preach and teach on the above occasions—but having read printed notes of his sermons, deponent cannot positively say, whether his understanding as to Mr. Campbell's teaching on the subject of this question, is derived from having heard Mr. Campbell, or from having read these

notes—but that the general impression of what he conceived A  
Mr. Campbell to have taught on the subject is as vivid as  
if he had heard him yesterday: but that did this obser-  
vation, as to the above printed notes, apply to the deponent's  
previous testimony, his whole evidence would require to be  
taken *cum nota*—the observation, therefore, is not to be ap- B  
plied to the rest of the evidence: Depones, that deponent's  
impression, as to what Mr. Campbell taught on that subject,  
when deponent heard him within the time libelled, is, that he  
taught that there was no holiness in anxiety—inasmuch, as  
it proceeded, in most cases, from selfish feelings, and had no C  
connexion with the glory of God. Being interrogated, whe-  
ther Mr. Campbell taught that an unbeliever could or could  
not have a sense of sin? Depones and answers, that deponent  
never understood Mr. Campbell to affirm that an unbeliever  
was necessarily ignorant that he was a sinner—nay, he might D  
feel that he was a great sinner—but that it was only through  
the belief of the gospel, and the receiving of God's views  
concerning sin, that men were taught to make a right estimate  
of it.

Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding E  
believers, in reference to the duty of self-examination and  
watchfulness? Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell state,  
as deponent thinks, on the Sabbath preceding the communion  
at Row, in 1830, that a believer's self-examination was not  
with a view of ascertaining whether he was a believer or not F  
—but for matter of humiliation and watchfulness for the  
future—and, in particular, in the prospect of the communion.  
Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, and if he  
did, what he taught concerning self-examination and watch-  
fulness in unbelievers: Depones, that he never understood G  
Mr. Campbell to address any precepts to unbelievers, but to  
call upon them to believe the gospel. That Mr. Campbell  
always taught that that which is born of the flesh is flesh,  
and therefore he could not address, to unbelievers, com-

**A**mands which they could not obey without the Spirit. Being interrogated whether deponent understood thereby, that unbelievers were not *responsible* to God for obedience to all his commands? Depones and answers—I always understood him to teach that all men, unbelievers as well as believers, **B**are all personally bound to glorify God—but not in the flesh—that is the natural state, which Mr. Campbell referred to the fall of man in Adam.

Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught concerning the relation between the Holy Spirit and all men? Depones **C** and answers—that he taught that Christ was the gift of God to all men, and that *in Christ* were contained all things pertaining to life and godliness, and that *in Christ* they had the Holy Ghost: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach that unbelievers were *in Christ*—but that all men were **D**cluded *under* Christ as a righteous head, through whom the forgiveness of sins flowed to all men: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach that unbelievers had the Holy Spirit *in them*.

Being interrogated whether deponent has heard Mr. Campbell in his teaching, apply the word redemption to the work of Christ? Depones, that he taught that all men were redeemed from the curse of the law by Christ—but certainly not from judgment to come, nor from subjection to the law as a rule of life—the work of Christ being for the very purpose, **F**pose, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us—not in the flesh, but in the spirit.

Being interrogated whether deponent remembers to have heard Mr. Campbell apply the words redemption and redeemed, to believers in particular? Depones and answers—**G** that deponent cannot recall any particular occasion on which he did so, but has heard Mr. Campbell apply the words “redeemed from all iniquity, and purified as a peculiar people, zealous of good works,” to the elect people of God.

Being interrogated whether deponent has heard Mr.

Campbell teach on the subject of assurance? Depones and answers—I have never heard Mr. Campbell preach a sermon on the subject of assurance, particularly; but I always understood him to preach that to believe God's love, and to be assured of it, is the same thing, and that no man is believing it who is not assured of it as applicable to himself—but B deponent has never understood Mr. Campbell to say, that a regenerate person may never lose the assurance of God's love to himself—but that in so doing, he is then not believing God's testimony.

Depones, that deponent was present at the visitation sermon which Mr. Campbell preached in July, 1830, before the Presbytery: Depones, that in that sermon Mr. Campbell, deponent thinks, said, in substance, that believers were the small number, or something to that effect. That the text was Matthew v. verses 1 to 12. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell in that sermon treated the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth verses? Depones and answers, I remember distinctly that Mr. Campbell spoke of those that were persecuted for righteousness' sake, and in illustrating that drew a parallel between the Jewish and Gentile dispensations; and also E made a very important remark, that when people persecuted for righteousness' sake they would not admit that it was for righteousness' sake—and in illustration of that remark quoted Isaiah lxvi. 5: Depones, that deponent was present at the dispensation of the Lord's supper in Mr. Campbell's F church in July, 1830: Depones, that on the Sabbath before the communion Sabbath, Mr. Campbell, in preaching from first Corinthians, eleventh chapter, in reference to the Lord's Supper, and more particularly to the latter part of that chapter, which has reference to the ordinance, Mr. Campbell distinct- G ly stated that the self-examination of believers there mentioned was not an examination whether they were believers—but whether, being believers, they were approaching the ordinance worthily, and in a right spirit, as seeing that that body had



A been broken, and that blood shed for themselves. That Mr. Campbell then also referred to 2d Corinthians xiii. 5, from which Mr. Campbell took occasion to state, that it did not refer to the examination whether a man was a believer or not—but referred to the particular state of the Corinthian B church at the time, which had made a demand upon the apostle, in the third verse, for a proof of Christ speaking in him; and that Mr. Campbell did not hold that a true believer could require self-examination in order to ascertain whether he was one or not—as that was a fact of which Mr. C Campbell thought a true believer could not be ignorant. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell thereby to teach that a true believer could never be tempted to lose sight of the fact of his being a believer? Depones and answers, far from it; I would make the same D remark here as I did in reference to the assurance of faith; and add, that faith being the belief of a testimony, a man must know without any examination whether he is believing it or not.

Interrogated for the libellers: Depones, that he was present when Mr. Campbell fenced the tables previously to the dispensation of the sacrament at Row, in July, 1830, and being interrogated whether, on that occasion, Mr. Campbell debarred from the Lord's Supper all who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation? Depones, that his impression was that as those alone could worthily partake of the ordinance who discerned the Lord's body therein, they could not do so worthily, who, in partaking of it, did not know that Christ had loved them, and given himself for them—which seemed to be in reference to the text of the action sermon. G Being interrogated whether he has understood Mr. Campbell to teach that in consequence of the death of Christ, the sins of every individual were pardoned, whether he believed it or not? Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that, in consequence of Christ's death, the forgiveness of sins

through his blood, ~~was~~ preached to every creature : by which A  
the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean, that personal guilt, during the day of grace, is not accounted of as debarring sinners from access to God, as a fountain of life, and that the work of Christ alone is sufficient to give the sinner confidence towards God as a father, to enable him to B  
look with open face at the glory of God, and to serve him with the spirit of a child, instead of that of a slave. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the forgiveness spoken of extended to every species and description of sin ? Depones, that he understood Mr. C  
Campbell to teach that this forgiveness was unlimited during the day of grace—but being designed by God to bring back the rebellious creature to himself, and to make him sympathize and share in his own righteous character, were this object not accomplished, the blood-shedding of the Lord D  
Jesus Christ, so far from averting that wrath which is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness, shall give the power and efficacy to the judgment inflicted at the great day, when Christ shall render to every man according to the deeds done in his body. That the de- E  
ponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the pardon of sin, already spoken of, included the sin of unbelief—because the unbelief itself might be considered the occasion of other sins. Being interrogated how he understood Mr. Campbell to reconcile the facts already deponed to that the sacrifice of F  
the Lord Jesus Christ had procured pardon or forgiveness for all men, and that this pardon or forgiveness included the sin of unbelief, with the fact separately deponed to—that, during the day of grace, every repeated act of unbelief was forgiven ? Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to G  
teach, that at any time, during the day of grace, the sinner may be told that God was not imputing his trespasses to him, and that he might then come with as much confidence as at any given period, when he might have previously heard the

A gospel, and disbelieved it, during the whole of such intermediate period.

Depones, that he never understood Mr. Campbell to say that a believer might not be without assurance of salvation—but understood him to say that when a regenerate person B had not the assurance of faith, he was not believing God's testimony. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation? Depones, that he certainly understood Mr. Campbell to teach—that the assurance of the C love of God to the individual was necessary to constitute saving faith.

Depones, that he has repeatedly heard Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness of sins. Being interrogated in what terms his prayer was conceived? Depones, that he never remarked D any thing peculiar in the terms—he used the words “Lord forgive us, and Lord forgive.” Being interrogated what he understood Mr. Campbell to pray for in thus praying for the forgiveness of sins? Depones, that Mr. Campbell's prayer implied, at once, a confession of sin, and an acknow- E ledgment that sin was hateful to God, and that the thing sought for was not simply the removal of a judicial sentence, but the removal of an evil hateful in God's sight: Depones, that the prayer implied a belief of the present good-will of God by which separation is sought for, by the sinner, between F himself and that sin which is hateful to God; and deponent then added an illustration, which he remembered Mr. Campbell to have used on the subject, and which, after having first verbally stated to the court the substance of it as given by Mr. Campbell, the deponent, with permission of the court, G committed to writing, in their presence, from memory, upon a separate paper, which he now dictated to the clerk as follows, “He had heard Mr. Campbell, at a private exposition, state the consistency and beauty of the duty of those who know that their sins are forgiven them, in praying for

forgiveness. After stating that any objection that might be A made to this duty, on the view of the forgiveness of sins being a *past act for all*, was equally applicable to the direction to believers so to pray—of whom it was acknowledged, at all hands, that their sins were forgiven—and adding that our Lord's prayer itself furnished an instance of B those who knew God as their Father, asking the forgiveness of sin—he proceeded to make an illustration in some such terms as the following: Let us suppose that a son has for some time been away from his father's house, and has, in profligacy and vice, acquired habits and manners quite the C reverse of what his father might like, or approve. Let us suppose that the young man, melted by undeserved kindness from his father, has returned to his father's house, and can now possibly entertain no doubt of his father's forgiveness, and constant good-will towards him. Should it appear D strange that, on any occasion, he, being conscious of something or many things in his manners that grieve his father, should, at the very time that he has no doubt of his forgiveness and good-will, say, father forgive me—and that he should even feel it his duty so to do, as expressing his own E unworthiness, and the unmerited goodness of that parent who is grieved by what he sees in him inconsistent with his condition as the child of such a father."

Being interrogated by Dr. Graham—When Mr. Campbell prayed for the forgiveness of sins in public worship, in reference to believers, did he ask a reversal of a judicial sentence on the part of God, or the enjoyment of a sense of the forgiving love of God? Depones and answers, that deponent understood that Mr. Campbell, in praying for the forgiveness of sin, in reference to believers, did not pray for G the reversal of a judicial sentence, as if it were a repetition of what the work of Christ has already accomplished—but the removal of every thing which, through the power of sin in the flesh, comes between the believer and the light of

- A** God's countenance: it implies a deprecation of that chastisement which God, as a father, inflicts upon his children, when they are not in the knowledge of their own unworthiness and God's love, and a recognition that God is faithful and just in forgiving their sins, and cleansing them from that
- B** unrighteousness which is a burden to them: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell pray for unbelievers, but never for the pardon of the sins of unbelievers—that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell pray that God would overlook their long-continued rebellion and rejection of him, and that he
- C** would put forth strength to subdue their opposition, and cause them to give him glory. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell meant by all men being redeemed from the curse of the law—was it from the judicial sentence of condemnation? Depones and answers, that
- D** by the work of Christ mankind were not under the law but under grace—understanding that it was now a righteous thing in God to receive any individual of that race without reference to the law he had broken, and that the sinner was as free to go to God, as his father, as if he had never violated
- E** that law, or that law had not existed. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that mankind being now under the gospel, and their sins forgiven—that this forgiveness implies that in this life the judicial sentence is reversed? Depones and answers, that he
- F** did understand Mr. Campbell to teach that during the day of grace men's sins are not imputed to them, in order that they may have access to God with confidence—and that the judicial sentence of the law is reversed. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to
- G** teach, in reference to unbelievers, in a future state, the judicial sentence of the law would be executed against them? Depones and answers, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that unbelievers will be judged not according to the law but the gospel—that they will be condemned for

having despised a goodness which should have led them to A repentance.

Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to exhort unbelievers, in his public discourses, to perform any duty? Depones and answers, that he exhorted them to believe the gospel—because unless a man believe the B gospel he could not perform any duty acceptably to God. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to exhort unbelievers to pray or repent? Depones, that deponent does not remember that Mr. Campbell ever exhorted unbelievers to pray, but certainly that he exhorted them to C repent—and that Mr. Campbell often represented to unbelievers their awful condition while rejecting Christ. Being interrogated—Does deponent understand that Mr. Campbell has exhorted unbelievers to pray for an interest in Christ? Depones, that he recollects Mr. Campbell expressing his D disapprobation of men praying for an interest in Christ—for without an interest in Christ he had no right to pray to God.

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton—whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of faith, and the assurance of salvation, were the same thing? Depones, that the assurance of salvation did, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, arise out of the assurance of faith—by holding fast the beginning of our confidence to the end. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of salvation depended F on the evidences of a regenerated state? Depones, that he has never heard Mr. Campbell speak on such a subject. Being interrogated what was that gospel which Mr. Campbell exhorted unbelievers to believe? Depones and answers, —it was that “God so loved the world,” by which is meant G every individual of the human race, “that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life.”—That the record of God was, “that he hath given us eternal life, and that life was in his

**A** Son"—that so God had put life into a truth—that truth was the word of His gospel—that truth believed is life eternal to him.

Being interrogated, did Mr. Campbell teach that God has the same desire and will that all men should come to Christ, **B** and believe on him? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that God has one honest desire and will that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved—which desire is frustrated in all except the elect, with regard to whom God's eternal purpose will not be

**C** defeated. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught was the nature of faith? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that faith was the belief of a testimony,—and that testimony is of God's holy love to the world, in giving his Son.

Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught if Christ **D** redeemed all mankind alike? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that Christ redeemed all mankind equally from the curse of the law—but those only who believe in Christ are redeemed from iniquity.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot—whether Mr. Campbell **E** taught that in the confession and acknowledgment of sin, the sin of unbelief was exclusively meant? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell meant by sin every manifestation of the flesh.

Interrogated by Mr. Story—what the witness understood **F** Mr. Campbell to teach regarding the way in which a believer's confidence is held fast day by day unto the end? Depones and answers—that although the work itself be the work of the Spirit of God in the believer, yet, as consciously his own act, it is by continuing to believe what God has spoken, and **G** beholding the glory of God as it shines in the face of Christ. Being interrogated whether he has heard Mr. Campbell connect the holding fast of the believer's confidence with such texts of Scripture, as for example, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling—Follow after holiness—

Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect?" Depones **A** and answers, that he has never heard any preaching so forcibly and powerfully inculcating holiness—or stating so fully the provision for such holiness being in us. Being interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell use such expressions as the following, "I could not conceive any thing **I B** would ask of God, which he has not told me that he has already given me?" Depones, that he does not remember Mr. Campbell making use of these words—but if they be referrible to any thing pertaining to life or godliness, he has heard Mr. Campbell use words of similar import: Depones, **C** that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell teach that the only cause of sorrow in any man was not believing himself to be in a state of favour with God: Depones, that the only causes of sorrow which Mr. Campbell stated ought to be in believers, were sin in themselves, and sin in the world, as dishonouring **D** God.

Re-interrogated by the defender.—Being interrogated, whether deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell directly teach or state any thing, from which deponent inferred that he held the existence of any desire or mind in God, that men should **E** be saved independently of their coming to the knowledge of the truth? Depones and answers—never—Mr. Campbell never taught that God desired that men should be saved without their being made fit for the enjoyment of himself. Being interrogated, whether deponent ever heard Mr. Camp- **F** bell teach that in any way, or at any time, God's judicial sentence or condemnation of sin, was done away or repealed? Depones and answers—never—the gospel is a greater manifestation than the law of God's condemnation of sin: Depones, that what Mr. Campbell taught concerning the conse- **G** quences of God's not imputing sin to any man—was, that if God were imputing sin to men they could not be in the enjoyment of any one comfort at his hands; otherwise, as deponent understood him to teach, it would be a premium



**A** upon iniquity, and a bounty upon sin. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were by nature guilty before God? Depones and answers, certainly he did.

The witness being shewn the three volumes of sermons, Numbers one, two, and three, docketed by the Moderator, **B** and referred to in the libel, and interrogated whether these are the printed notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons, alluded to in a former part of his deposition? Depones and answers, that they are. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

**C** (Signed) J. W. HAWKINS.

WILLIAM BONAR, Esq. Banker, St. Mary's parish, Edinburgh, aged about thirty-four years, unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial **D** counsel: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell preach and expound during the year libelled: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach upon the fifth chapter of Matthew, verses first to twelfth, in his own church, at the visitation by the Presbytery, in July, 1830: Depones, that **E** deponent thinks he heard Mr. Campbell treat both the doctrine of universal atonement, and that of assurance of faith, on that occasion: Depones, that deponent understood that the text led Mr. Campbell to treat these subjects—the characters which he described being those of true believers: Depones, that deponent rather thinks he has heard Mr. Campbell expound in Edinburgh between September 1829, and July, 1830, and he thinks it must have been more than once: Depones, that deponent was in Helensburgh during two Sundays, the one before, and the other after the visitation **G** sermon, and he thinks he heard Mr. Campbell on both those occasions.

Being interrogated to what deponent understood Mr. Campbell on these occasions to ascribe the mission of the Son of God to this world? Depones and answers, "To the

love of God to the world." Being interrogated what Mr. A Campbell taught was the manifestation of God's love to the world? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that the love of God to the world was seen in the death of Christ to put away the sins of the world: Depones, that what deponent gives is his impression regarding the substance of Mr. Campbell's teaching during the period libelled. That except the three sermons above deponed to, the witness has no recollection of particular dates. Being interrogated where Mr. Campbell taught that God's hatred of sin was chiefly to be seen? Depones and answers, in the death of his C Son for the sins of the world. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught as to God's intention towards the world in sending his Son to die for its sins? Depones and answers, he taught that it was God's intention that the world should be reconciled to him, and that men should be saved. Being D interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean in saying that Christ had put away the sins of the world? Depones and answers, he taught that in consequence of the death of Christ, as a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, God had done a work whereby he was righteous in E not imputing sin to the world. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach in speaking of God's intention that men should be saved? Depones and answers, God's desire that men should be delivered from the enmity of their hearts towards them. Being interrogated F whether Mr. Campbell did or did not teach that putting away of the sins of the world by Christ's death did of itself deliver men from the enmity of their hearts towards God? Depones and answers, that deponent did understand Mr. Campbell to teach so—that it does put away the enmity of G the heart *when believed*. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that it did so when not believed? Depones and answers, he did not.

Being interrogated whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell

- A** teach regarding the power by which a man believes it? Depones and answers, I think so, by the power of the Holy Spirit. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught regarding the relation between the putting away of sin in Christ's death and judgment to come? Depones and answers,
- B** I always understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the putting away of sin presupposed judgment to come. Being interrogated on whom Mr. Campbell taught that that judgment was to come? Depones and answers, on all men without exception. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught concerning those who believe not, in reference to that judgment? Depones and answers, he taught in reference to them who believe not, that in that day they shall be condemned because they believed not the love of God. Being interrogated whether he heard Mr. Campbell teach the relation between that
- D** condemnation for unbelief and the evil deeds of men? Depones and answers, I always understood that he taught a distinct relation between the two. Being interrogated what was the relation so taught? Depones and answers, it was that the evil deeds of men arise from their not believing in
- E** the love of God. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught that this unbelief arose from? Depones and answers, from their evil heart of unbelief—from their being unwilling to believe the love of God—that by nature every man was in that state of unwillingness. Being interrogated whether Mr.
- F** Campbell, in teaching regarding the non-imputation of sin, included all sins? Depones and answers, that God was not imputing any sin to any man in the world. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught in that matter regarding the sin of unbelief? Depones and answers, I understood him to
- G** teach that unbelief was a state or character—but that sins of unbelief are those sins that are forgiven. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the relation towards God into which the creature came by having his sins put away in the death of Christ? Depones and answers, he

taught the relation to be, that there was then no barrier in A the way preventing the creature from rejoicing in God as his God. Being interrogated whether or not deponent understood the removal of that barrier to be what Mr. Campbell taught as constituting the pardon or forgiveness of sin? Depones and answers, I did. Being interrogated whether B Mr. Campbell ever taught regarding the redemption of all men by Christ? Depones and answers, yes—that all men were redeemed by the blood of Christ. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the consequent relation between all men and Christ? Depones and answers, that C Christ, because of his work and righteousness, was made head over all—and that from his being so, men were in that state in which God was not imputing sin to them. That in consequence of this work of redemption Christ had been made Judge over all, and all judgment had been committed D to him. That the redemption of all men, thus effected by Christ, was certainly not a redemption from his judgment. Being interrogated whether in teaching regarding this redemption of all men by Christ, and the putting away of the sins of all men in the death of Christ, Mr. Campbell taught E that God had so put away his own condemnation of sin? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that he had not put away his condemnation of sin. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the test, or rule of judgment, by which Christ would try men at his judgment? Depones and answers, he taught that it was their love to himself.

Being interrogated whether the deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach regarding the source, root, or principle of all acceptable obedience to God? Depones and answers, I G think I have—that that root was love to himself. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the possibility of unbelievers obeying God? Depones and answers, he taught that it was impossible. Being interrogated what

A Mr. Campbell taught regarding the obligation of unbelievers to obey God? Depones and answers, he taught that they were under that obligation. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers were or were not guilty before God? Depones and answers, he taught that they were guilty in not believing and loving God.

Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell, in his preaching, expounding, or prayers, said any thing regarding the confession of sin? Depones and answers, I have heard Mr. Campbell confess sin. Being interrogated whether he heard C Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness of sin? Depones and answers, I have.

Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught regarding the interest of men in Christ? Depones and answers, I understand him to say, that all men have an interest in D Christ. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean in saying so? Depones and answers, that Christ died for their sins, and that, in consequence, God was not imputing sin to them.

Being interrogated whether deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach regarding assurance? Depones and answers, yes, E regarding the assurance of faith, and also the assurance of salvation. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell expressed in using the words, assurance of faith? Depones and answers, the assurance of God's love to the individual believer. F Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell expressed by the assurance of salvation? Depones and answers, "the consciousness of being, individually, in a state of reconciliation, and peace with God." Being interrogated whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell state a connexion between these two, G and if so, what was the connexion so stated? Depones and answers, he stated that it was impossible for a man to have the assurance of God's love to himself, individually, without the consciousness of being in a state of salvation. Being interrogated whether or not deponent understood Mr. Camp-

bell, in so speaking, to state or imply that a regenerate man A could be at any time without the assurance of salvation? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught, that as that assurance depended on a man's believing, it was only whilst a man believed that he possessed that assurance, and he might not always be believing. B

Being interrogated whether deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell call men to repentance? Depones and answers, yes, I have heard him press repentance upon men. Being interrogated by what arguments Mr. Campbell pressed repentance upon men? Depones and answers, he did so by C representing sin as an evil thing, offensive to God, and as sinning against the love of God, who had blotted out, or put away their sins. Being interrogated what relation Mr. Campbell taught to exist between repentance and the judgment to come? Depones and answers, that he taught that D in repenting, men came into that state in which they were prepared to meet that judgment. Being interrogated whether deponent, in hearing Mr. Campbell, did or did not understand the view given by him of the love of God to all men, as calculated to leave men easy in sin? E

Objected to on the part of the libellers, that the question is incompetent, as involving a mere matter of opinion on the part of the witness. To which it was answered, on the part of the defender, that the question was put to the witness in order to meet, by its answer, evidence already on record— F and, in particular, an observation appended by Dr. Burns, to an answer given by him when cross-interrogated for the defender; and that although no such contrary evidence had existed on record, the question as put was in itself perfectly competent, being not an appeal to the opinion of the witness, G but a question, in point of fact, as to the effect produced in the mind of the hearer at the time when Mr. Campbell spoke. The Presbytery repelled the objection, and allowed the question to be put. From which, finding Dr. Fleming

A dissented and protested, for leave to complain to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, on the ground that the question refers to the opinion, and not to the evidence of the witness, and that it is incompetent and irregular, as well as highly inexpedient, to load the record with matter that cannot be considered as testimony—and took instruments and craved extracts. To which dissent and complaint, Messrs. Jaffray, Carr, Sym, and Lochore, adhered.

And the question being put: Depones and answers, that deponent understood that the view of the love of God C given by Mr. Campbell, was directly calculated to produce holiness, as being the only view of the character of God, by which a man can come to be at peace with him. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that the non-imputation of sin to the world, by the death of Christ, D was eternal? Depones, that deponent does not recollect Mr. Campbell to have expressed himself so—but that deponent understood him to teach that it implied a full forgiveness to every man, of all his sins, during this life. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell did or did not teach that the E Holy Spirit was in every man? Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach so—but taught that he was in Christ Jesus for every man. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that all men had the life of Christ? Depones and answers—that he taught that no man had the life F of Christ in him, until he believed. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were in Christ? Depones and answers, that he does not recollect Mr. Campbell to have said so—but to have taught that Christ was head over all men, and that through him the blessing of G God's forgiving love had come upon them, and that in that sense they were in Christ. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that all men were members of the body of which Christ was the head? Depones, I did not. Being interrogated whether Mr. Camp-

bell taught that God had joy over all men, or only over A believers? Depones and answers, that he understood him to teach that God had joy only over believers—that others were rejecting his love—and that he grieved over them while in that state.

Interrogated for the libellers, whether Mr. Campbell, in his B sermon, preached before the Presbytery, taught any thing regarding the character of peacemaker, in reference to Christ, having died for every human being? Depones, that he did: That he taught that he alone had the character of peacemaker, who was in a state of reconciliation with God; and that he C alone had the character of peacemaker who believed the love of God to himself personally. Being interrogated, depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, in the same sermon, that the love of God to every man was to be measured by the sufferings of Christ. And being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell D taught that it was an indispensable feature, in the character of a Christian, that he should know that God has had mercy on him, and has forgiven him? Depones and answers, that this is what he understood to be the substance of what Mr. Campbell taught within the period libelled. Being interro- E gated what he understood Mr. Campbell to have prayed for when he prayed, as formerly deponed, for the forgiveness of sins? Depones and answers, that the forgiveness of sin taught by Mr. Campbell, being the non-imputation of sin, in consequence of a work done for the sinner, by Christ Jesus—those F who understand this view of forgiveness, having, through it, learned to hate the sin thus forgiven, are, in praying for the forgiveness of sin, confessing sin as an evil thing in the sight of God—repenting of the sin thus committed against a God, who had thus forgiven them, and deprecating the visitations G of their Father, because of having so sinned. The witness would also add, that, in such a prayer, there is a prayer for grace to cease from sowing to the flesh: Depones, that in stating the above answer, the deponent means to express his



A understanding of what Mr. Campbell prayed for, when he prayed for the forgiveness of sins.

Re-interrogated for the defender : what he understood Mr. Campbell to mean in deprecating the fatherly visitations of God for sin? Depones and answers, temporal afflictions—  
B by which deponent means, afflictions in this life—chastenings from God.

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton : What blessings did Mr. Campbell teach were derived from the love of God, when it is known and believed? Depones and answers, that when  
C that love is believed, the man so enters into peace—becomes a member of the body of Christ—and so has eternal life. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach was the cause of the sin and misery of those who do not understand and believe the love of God? Depones and answers, an evil heart of un-  
D belief. Being interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach is the cause of the ruin of those who perish? Depones and answers, their ignorance of God, from a wilful unbelief of his love.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot, whether Mr. Campbell E stated, that in the day of judgment men shall be condemned, because they believed not the love of God, as extending to men universally? Depones and answers, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers will be condemned in the day of judgment, because of not believing the  
F love of God to themselves. Being interrogated, what he understood Mr. Campbell to teach when he said, sin was imputed to no man in this life? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach that every man's sins are fully and freely forgiven : Interrogated, whether such forgiveness  
G is limited to the present life? Depones and answers, it is a full forgiveness, and is never recalled.

Interrogated by Mr. Story : Whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that these sins are ever to be called to remembrance? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Camp-

bell to teach, that God will bring every work into judgment, A whether it be good or evil. Being interrogated what he understood Mr. Campbell to teach regarding the influence which the fact of their forgiveness would have upon men's future punishment? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the fact of the forgiveness of sin, as mani- B festing the love of God to the sinner, would be the ground of his condemnation, as not having believed the love of God. Being interrogated: depones, that the rejection of this forgiveness is the aggravation of their guilt. Being interrogated: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, C that a sinner discovers the love of God to himself, in the manifestation of the love of God to the world, by the death of his Son: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that belief, or faith, is the only way by which a sinner can be made holy: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to D teach, that a sinner could not enjoy salvation while he continued in his sins, and that God abhorred sin in his people, as well as in unbelievers. And being interrogated, whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the belief of the fact, of a man's being individually reconciled to God, constituted E the faith of the gospel? Depones and answers, that the belief of that fact, understanding it as the putting away of his own sins, was, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, the faith of the gospel. Being interrogated in what way he understood Mr. Campbell to teach this reconciliation was effectual? De- F ponos and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that the way of reconciliation was the manifestation of God's character to sinners, through the death of his Son, as a ground of confidence for every sinner to trust in him. Being interrogated, Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the G believing contemplation of the work of Christ was inseparably connected with the knowledge of our being reconciled, and that this knowledge of the work of Christ preceded our personal reconciliation—understanding by that, our being

**A** personally at peace with God : Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach; that the way in which that knowledge produced holiness was, by producing in the sinner, love to God, and, therefore, an abhorrence of every thing opposed to his will.

**B** Interrogated by Dr. Fleming: Whether he recollects the texts on which he heard Mr. Campbell preach as before deponed? Depones and answers, that he does not recollect the texts from which Mr. Campbell preached on the Sabbath before, and the Sabbath after the visitation sermon: Depones,

**C** that deponent has repeatedly heard Mr. Campbell lecture in Edinburgh, in the course of the period libelled: Depones, that he does not recollect the precise expressions used by Mr. Campbell—but has given what he understands the substance of his teaching: Depones, that the deponent does not

**D** recollect Mr. Campbell praying for deliverance from wrath to come: Depones, that Mr. Campbell confessed sins in his prayers, both generally and specially. Being interrogated, whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that assurance of God's love to a man personally was essential to faith?

**E** Depones and answers in the affirmative—and that this assurance was essential to salvation: Depones; that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that believers are continually falling into sin, and committing all varieties of sins, or acts of disobedience to, and resistance of the will of God: De-

**F**pones, that Mr. Campbell, in calling men to repentance, urged men to repent of the state of unbelief and enmity against God in which they were, and in which they were continually sinning, and to repent of all their sins. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that a sinner is

**G** condemned solely for his unbelief, or for his other sins also? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to have taught that a sinner is condemned because he is found unrighteous; and that he is found so, because of his not having believed the love of God: Depones, that deponent under-

stood Mr. Campbell to mean by "the life of Christ in a man" A the having eternal life.

Re-interrogated by the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that all men had their evil and corrupt natures by descent from Adam. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man who saw the love of God to B himself, but did not see the love of God to the whole world, was or was not a believer? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach that a man who saw the love of God to himself was a believer. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the judgment to come was to C be executed by the Father or by the Son? Depones and answers, by the Son. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught to be God's object in bringing every work, good or evil, to light in the day of judgment? Depones and answers, to manifest the righteousness of that judgment. D Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man, believing the forgiveness of sin without knowing the character of God, believed unto salvation? Depones and answers, he taught that that man only who saw the character of God in the forgiveness was saved: Depones, that deponent never E recollects Mr. Campbell to have taught that a man could believe the forgiveness of his sin without knowing the character of God. Being interrogated whether the deponent understood Mr. Campbell, in speaking of believing in this forgiveness of sins, to mean the belief in a historical fact, or F the understanding of a truth? Depones and answers, the understanding of a truth—the receiving of the love of God into the heart. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean by the character of God, the knowledge of which is inseparable from belief in the forgiveness of sins? Depones and answers, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the character of God seen in the forgiveness of sins is love to the sinner who believes that doctrine.

- A Re-interrogated by Mr. Story, whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that when a man believed in the forgiveness of his sins, he thereby felt himself delivered from the obligations of the law, or placed in a condition to obey it? Depones and answers, I understand Mr. Campbell taught that then only would the sinner feel himself in a condition to obey the law, and so to glorify God: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the power which a sinner received to obey the law, on believing the forgiveness of his sins, was the power of the Holy Spirit.
- C Re-interrogated by defender: Whether Mr. Campbell taught that in the death of Christ, through which God is not imputing sin to the world, there was any manifestation of God's character besides the manifestation of his love? Depones and answers, yes; while it was the manifestation of God's love to every sinner—it also manifested his condemnation of the sins of the world. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed).. WILLIAM BONAR.

- E Captain JAMES PATERSON, residing at Linlathen, Presbytery of Dundee, aged about forty-six years, married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent resided at Row during summer and autumn 1829—that he left the parish in October 1829—that he returned to reside in the parish in June 1830, and left it again in October 1830—and attended on the ministration of the defender while residing in the parish: Depones, that Mr. Campbell frequently delivered discourses in the manse, and in the school-house at Helensburgh, as well as in the pulpit, at which deponent attended regularly, with one or two exceptions. That deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach a sermon in the school-house at Helensburgh, in autumn 1829, on the text, "Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Why then is not the

health of the daughter of my people recovered?" Of which A sermon the deponent took notes—29th September, 1829: Depones, that deponent thinks Mr. Campbell spoke both of universal atonement, and of the assurance of faith, in that sermon. Being interrogated whether deponent has taken any notes of what Mr. Campbell stated on these subjects, and if B so, what his notes contain? Depones and answers, that when deponent took notes from Mr. Campbell's sermons, he took them with a view to be extended afterwards, for his own use. That the pencil notes of the sermon above mentioned, and now in deponent's hand, have lain beside deponent unaltered C and unexamined since they were taken—but that since learning that he was to be called as a witness in this case, deponent has transcribed them in ink, adding certain connecting words and expressions, and sometimes whole sentences— D but that deponent inserted these sentences simply to preserve the connexion, and bring out the idea, and does not think there can be above half a dozen of them—and that deponent is perfectly willing now to make use of either set of notes as the Presbytery may please: Depones, that the reason why deponent transcribed the notes, as above mentioned, was, that E there would be considerable difficulty in reading his pencil notes in presence of the court, although deponent would have much greater satisfaction in reading the pencil notes.

The Presbytery declined to interfere, and leave the counsel to manage his case in his own way. And being asked F by the counsel for the defender to refer to his pencil notes:

Depones, that the first head of Mr. Campbell's discourse was to shew the disease under which men were. Being interrogated whether in describing that disease Mr. Campbell spoke of man's guilt in the sight of God? Depones and G answers, most certainly. The next head of discourse was the inquiry—"whether they were healed?" Depones, that in stating the disease of men Mr. Campbell stated it to be enmity against God. Being interrogated what Mr. Camp-

A bell stated regarding the physician mentioned in the text ? Depones and answers, that he stated that the physician was the Spirit of God, given to every man in Christ to apply the balm. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell stated the reason why men did not benefit by the balm ? Depones B and answers, he stated it to be that men did not believe that there was balm in Gilead. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to refer to in using the words balm in Gilead ? Depones, that Mr. Campbell said in substance, as far as deponent remembers, that the balm in C Gilead was this, " That God so loved the world that he sent his only begotten Son, not to condemn the world—but that the world through him might be saved." That Christ had tasted death for every man—and, according to deponent's notes, that the balm was the blood. Being interrogated D whether Mr. Campbell in that sermon said any thing regarding seriousness, and if so, what was the substance of what he said ? Depones, that what Mr. Campbell said on that subject stands, in deponent's notes, in connexion with a statement regarding persons who go to church and come E away thinking themselves better because they had been deeply impressed. Being interrogated : Depones, that this seriousness was spoken of by Mr. Campbell in reference to the cure of the disease that is in man, and that Mr. Campbell stated that a man might go to church under a wrong F impression of his disease—not knowing his disease—and that this seriousness which he might acquire was not the cure. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell, in so speaking of seriousness, to refer to godly sorrow for sin ? Depones and answers, I did not. Being inter- G rogated whether Mr. Campbell, on that occasion, pressed the acceptance of the gospel upon his hearers ? Depones and answers, yes. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell spoke of the ground on which man would be rejected of God at last ? Depones and answers, that the only way

in which deponent remembers Mr. Campbell to have brought A it in was by saying, that they were not cured of their disease, and that they must remain uncured. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say in reference to the manifestation of God's character in the death of Christ? Depones and answers, that God was condemn- B ing the disease in which man lay, but that, while he condemned the sin, he loved the sinner. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell said any thing in that sermon expressing that God's love in Christ was suited to make men easy in sin? Depones and answers, that the whole tenor of his C sermon was quite contrary to that.

Being interrogated where deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that God's greatest abhorrence of sin was to be seen? Depones and answers, in the sufferings of Christ. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that God D abhorred sin in believers or in all men? Depones and answers, that God abhors sin in all men. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell did or did not teach that the putting away of sin, in the death of Christ, was a putting away of God's righteous condemnation of sin? Depones and answers, certainly E not—that God must ever view sin in the same light. Being interrogated what relation Mr. Campbell taught to subsist between the putting away of sin in Christ and judgment to come? Depones and answers, that the putting away of sins in Christ was a preparation for the judgment to come: De- F pones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to state, that God's intention in putting away sin in Christ was that every man should be righteously judged: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that that judgment was to be exercised by Christ: Depones, that deponent G understood Mr. Campbell to teach, as the ground of this judgment, that eternal life had been given to every man in Christ, and that Christ had made propitiation for the sins of the whole world—and that every man is to be judged for



A receiving or rejecting this eternal life—which Mr. Campbell made to consist in the knowledge of God. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man believing in the forgiveness of sin, without seeing the character of God, was believing unto salvation? Depones and answers, B certainly not. Being interrogated, whether, when Mr. Campbell spoke of belief, deponent understood him to mean belief of an historical fact—or the understanding of a truth? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that you are to believe what God has revealed of his character in the C truth.

Being interrogated whether, in order to a man's believing God, it was necessary, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, that he should see in the truth the love of God to himself? Depones and answers, certainly. Being interrogated D whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man who saw the love of God to himself, individually, but did not understand the love of God to the world, manifested in the death of Christ, was or was not a believer? Depones and answers, certainly, that he was. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell E taught who would eventually be found, at the expiry of the day of grace, to have believed on the love of God, and the name of Christ? Depones and answers, the chosen of God, the elect of God. Being interrogated who had life, when life was given to all men in Christ? Depones, those who F believed on Christ. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught the having of life in Christ, was co-extensive with the curse? Depones and answers, that he did—that Christ is the gift of God to every man, and that in this sense, every man has life in Christ. Being interrogated whether G Mr. Campbell taught that all men were alive unto God? Depones and answers, no: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the Holy Spirit is not in every man. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell stated any relation between the deeds of men and the judgment to come? Depones

and answers, certainly—that every man will be tried according to his deeds: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers could not obey God, but that all men are under obligation to obey God.

Being interrogated whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach regarding the doctrine of assurance? Depones, that that doctrine ran through all Mr. Campbell's teaching: Depones, that, according to deponent's understanding of Mr. Campbell's teaching, in regard to the assurance of faith, it was that faith must have an object, and that assurance of faith is neither more nor less than a believing the existence of the thing. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that a regenerate person might be not assured of the existence of the object of his faith? Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach that a regenerate person may be in darkness—and that he may not, at times, have the object of his faith before him: Depones, that, in regard to the assurance of salvation, Mr. Campbell taught, that every one who believes, must know that Christ has died for his sins, and that, understanding salvation to mean present life, such a belief is necessary to it. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man could not be an heir of the kingdom of God, without being able always to say, that Christ died for his sins? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man might be an heir of the kingdom of God, without being able always to say so. Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell say, that a man's being without assurance of salvation was a positive proof that he was a child of the devil: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell fence the tables at the sacrament, in July, 1830. Being interrogated whether, on that occasion, deponent heard Mr. Campbell debarring any person from coming to the table? Depones, that the deponent has but an indistinct recollection of what Mr. Campbell said in fencing the tables—but if Mr. Campbell had debarred any one, deponent thinks he would

A have noticed it, because, a few days before, deponent had a conversation with Mr. Campbell on the subject, in which Mr. Campbell stated, that it was not the duty of a minister to debar any one, but to state the mind of God in reference to the institution, and to let every man approach or stay away, bearing his own responsibility.—That deponent heard the address after the serving of the tables.

Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell declare the forgiveness of sins, as the removal of the barrier between God and man—and in connexion with this, deponent refers C to pencil notes in deponent's hand, taken by him at the time from a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell, on the 29th August, 1830; which notes he cannot say are the very words of Mr. Campbell, although he intended, at the time, to take down the words—which notes are as follows, viz.

D “Consider the sacrificial work of Christ, condemning sin in the flesh—it is the doing away of sin—and clearing away the barrier between man and God. It is sacrificial, because it is expiatory, and on it is grounded the forgiveness of sin. Man is now seen, every human being, under Christ as a head, E and thus every human being has access to God. Our sin, therefore, is no longer a reason why we should not come to God.” Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach that every man has an interest in Christ, in as much as Christ has tasted death for every man. That Mr. Campbell F certainly did not express by that interest of all men in Christ, the same relation as believers have with Christ by faith: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell's sermon at the visitation by the Presbytery, and it appeared similar to all that deponent has ever heard from Mr. Campbell.

G Interrogated for the libellers: Depones, that in the sermon preached by Mr. Campbell in the school-house at Helensburgh, Mr. Campbell taught that God loves all: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, in that sermon, that Christ is the balm, and that the balm is stored up in Christ—that the

blood is the balm, and that every man not availing himself A of it, was rejecting it. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell then taught that the only way in which the balm and the physician could be available to any person, was by his simply believing that God was reconciled to all when Christ died, and that he is not imputing sin to any? Depones, B that Mr. Campbell did not then teach, that in order for any one to avail himself of the balm, it was necessary that he should believe that the balm was for all.

Being interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell teach, that in consequence of the death of Christ the sins of C every individual were pardoned? Depones, that he certainly has, in so far as he had removed the barrier between the sinner and God, so that every man had access to God. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that no man could come to Christ without knowing that his sins were D pardoned? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses—and that no one can come to God without believing that this is the mind of God in reference to himself. Being interrogated whether E Mr. Campbell taught that an assurance of final salvation was essential to the character of a believer? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell did not so teach—that Mr. Campbell taught that every man must believe or be assured that Christ died for him, before he can have that assurance. Being in- F terrogated, wherein he understood Mr. Campbell to have taught in the sermon in the school-house that the cure spoken of consisted? Depones and answers, that he has already answered that question. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell, in fencing the tables, at the communion in July, 1830, stated G that if any man partook of the ordinance without having an assurance of his own salvation he would do so at his own peril, or words to that effect? Depones, that he thinks these are words that Mr. Campbell did not use. Being interro-

**A** gated—whether, in the sermon preached before the Presbytery, Mr. Campbell spoke of it being essential to the character of a peace-maker, that a man should know that Christ died for every human being? Depones, that he does not think Mr. Campbell made that statement, or any thing to that

**B** effect: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach two sermons in the parish church of Row, on the 8th September, 1829—that of these sermons the deponent took notes, but he is not at present possessed of them. And being interrogated, whether, in any of the said sermons, or on any other

**C** occasion, during the period libelled, Mr. Campbell used any expressions similar to the following, viz. “Christ’s blood then must have been shed for every one of you, and your present condition is that your sins are entirely done away in Christ, and that Christ has the Holy Spirit for you.—All

**D** this must be true, or your not rejoicing would be no sin?” Depones and answers, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach, that Christ’s blood was shed for every man—that he has understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the present condition of every man is that his sins are entirely done away in

**E** Christ, in as much as Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world—and that God is not imputing their trespasses unto men. Being interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell teach any thing to this effect, “that the religion of God begins with pardon—and that its very

**F** first step is to still the selfishness in man, by telling him that he is already pardoned?” Depones, that, understanding by the religion of God, the knowledge of God, and entering into his mind, the first step, Mr. Campbell taught, must be to know God as he has revealed himself in Jesus Christ, and

**G** that Christ has suffered for his sins—and that the religion of God is not a selfish religion, but consists in living to the glory of God.

Re-interrogated for defender: What Mr. Campbell taught, in reference to discerning the Lord’s body in coming to the

table of the Lord? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that A in coming to the table of the Lord, a man must know that the body, of which the bread is the symbol, has been broken for him, and that the blood, of which the wine is the symbol, has been shed for him; and that Mr. Campbell most certainly left it to men themselves, to determine whether they knew B that.

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton: When the sinner believed to the saving of his soul, what is the thing, according to what Mr. Campbell taught, that he believes? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that Christ died for his sins, and that God C is not imputing sin to him: Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the belief that Christ died for his sins, and that God is not imputing sin to him is the faith of the gospel? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that in believing D these things, the believer enters into the mind of God, and enjoys God—that a sinner is not called to believe an abstract fact, but to know the mind of God in the thing which he is called to believe, and that a man that enjoys God is a Christian.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: What Mr. Campbell taught, E was the mind of God, in the thing which a sinner is called on to believe? Depones and answers, that in Christ his sin is condemned, and his sin forgiven; and that God has sent his Son to bless him in turning him from his iniquities. •

Interrogated by Mr. Sym: What deponent understood Mr. F Campbell to teach “the life in Christ” to be? Depones, the entering into the knowledge of God as he is revealed in Jesus Christ—entering into this is entering into life—that all men have life in Christ—but all men do not enter into it, because all men do not believe. G

Re-interrogated by the defender: Whether Mr. Campbell ever stated the distinction between having life in Christ, and life? Depones and answers, most certainly. Being interrogated whether, while Mr. Campbell taught that all men are

- A** under Christ as a righteous head, he also taught that all men are in Christ? Depones and answers, he taught that all men have life in Christ, but not that all men are in Christ. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that being in Christ, was necessary to the possession of that life, which all
- B** men have in Christ? Depones and answers, certainly. Being interrogated whether, when Mr. Campbell taught that all men had life in Christ, and when he taught that God had given, to all men, Christ, and eternal life in him, Mr. Campbell meant the same thing? Depones, that he meant exactly the
- C** same thing.

- Interrogated by Dr. Fleming: Depones, that no man would have been prepared for judgment to come, without the putting away of sin in Christ: Depones, that deponent understands Mr. Campbell to have taught that judgment presup-
- D** poses forgiveness. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that without this putting away of sin there would have been no judgment? Depones, that he cannot charge his memory with what Mr. Campbell taught on that subject. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught concerning the
- E** way in which a man who did not understand the love of God to the world, manifested in the death of Christ, but who saw the love of God to himself, individually, came to see this love to himself? Depones and answers, by the teaching of the Spirit. Being interrogated whether, on any occasion, Mr.
- F** Campbell taught concerning the fruits of faith? Depones and answers, that understanding, by the fruits of faith—living to God—being holy—and walking as a new creature in the world—deponent never heard Mr. Campbell preach without pressing them upon his hearers: Depones, that the examina-
- G** tion, which Mr. Campbell recommended, before partaking of the Lord's supper, was confined to believers—being not an examination into a ground of confidence, but an examination whether, at the time, a believer was in a fit state to partake of the ordinance, discerning the Lord's body, seeing that

Christ had suffered for him, and entering into the communion A of Christ's sufferings: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has taught that it is an ordinance in remembrance of what you have known; not a converting ordinance, but a strengthening and life-giving ordinance: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has always prayed for the forgiveness of sins—though the deponent B does not recollect the terms in which he did so: Depones, that deponent has never heard Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness of unbelief—unbelief being a character or condition—but he has heard him pray for the forgiveness of sins of unbelief. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer C to God.

(Signed) JAMES PATERSON.

JOHN BARCLAY, Esq., residing in Hope street, parish of St. George's, Edinburgh, aged about 50, widower, being D solemnly sworn, and examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell preach or discourse frequently, during the year libelled, and has heard him teach in regard to universal atonement and assurance. That Mr. Campbell taught that E God had done a work in Christ for all men; and the character of which Mr. Campbell stated to be, that God had given his Son to taste of death for every man. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell, in so teaching, meant that men were saved, whether they believed it or not? Depones and an- F swers, certainly not; but that Mr. Campbell taught that, whether a man believed it or not, God was not imputing sin to him: That deponent has heard Mr. Campbell use the words pardon and forgiveness in reference to this. Being G interrogated, whether the pardon and forgiveness, so spoken of by Mr. Campbell, expressed the state of a man's mind, or an act of God? Depones and answers, the latter. Being interrogated, when Mr. Campbell taught that that act was performed? Depones and answers, immediately after the fall



- A** of man, but that it only took effect, in point of time, in the death of Christ. Being interrogated, to what Mr. Campbell ascribed the continuance of men, and of the blessings which they have enjoyed since the fall? Depones and answers, to the work done in Christ. Being interrogated, whether Mr.
- B** Campbell taught why he ascribed these things to that work? Depones and answers, yes—because, when men sinned we cannot see why they should not have been immediately consigned to punishment, had it not been for this work in Christ. Being interrogated, what relation Mr. Campbell taught to
- C** exist between the holiness of God and this work in Christ for all men? Depones and answers, I think in this way, “that God made known his character in this work of Christ, in condemning sin, while at the same time this forgiveness was bestowed. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell
- D** explained what he meant his hearers to understand, when he spoke of the pardon and forgiveness of all men, in consequence of the work in Christ? Depones and answers, yes—that, on the part of God, every barrier was removed between him and the sinner. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell
- E** taught, regarding the justice of God in inviting sinners to come to him? Depones and answers, that, in having laid their punishment on Christ, God is just in forgiving their sin—and that Mr. Campbell taught, that but for the work in Christ, for all men, God would not be just in inviting sinners
- F** to come to him. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught to be in God which would prevent him from being just in inviting sinners to come to him, but for the work in Christ for all? Depones and answers, that he does not recollect any particular statement on that point. Being interro-
- G** gated whether Mr. Campbell taught that while on the part of God there is no barrier between him and the sinner, there is any such barrier on the part of the sinner? Depones and answers, yes, certainly—which barrier, on the part of the sinner, consisted in his unwillingness to return to God.

Being interrogated, if he heard Mr. Campbell teach how, or A by whom that unwillingness, on the part of the sinner, was ever overcome? Depones and answers, yes, by the Holy Spirit given in Christ. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that repentance and returning to God were or were not synonymous? Depones and answers, yes, I think syno- B nymous. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that repentance was or was not indispensable to escaping wrath? Depones and answers, I think indispensable. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that in this pardon, forgiveness, or removal of the barrier between God C and the sinner, there was a removal of God's condemnation of sin? Depones and answers, yes. Being interrogated, what he understood Mr. Campbell to mean by this removal of the condemnation of sin? Depones and answers, that God had really and truly forgiven the sins of all men for the sake D of Christ. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell so to teach that God thenceforward approved of sin? Depones and answers, certainly not—that God's mind was not changed, and could not be changed in regard to the character of sin as sin. Being interrogated, whether Mr. E Campbell taught that, in consequence of the work in Christ, God had or had not ceased to reveal his wrath against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men? Depones and answers, that he had not ceased. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught, that at the day of judgment men F would or would not be judged for their deeds? Depones and answers, that they would not. Being interrogated, how or for what Mr. Campbell taught that they would be judged? Depones, according to their state, as godly or ungodly—as having received or rejected the testimony of God in Christ. G Being interrogated how Mr. Campbell taught that men, in this life, shew their godliness or ungodliness? Depones and answers, by the holiness and unholiness of their lives. Being interrogated, whether, when Mr. Campbell taught that men

**A** were not to be judged for their deeds, he taught that they were not to be judged for the holiness or unholiness of their lives, by which they shewed whether they were godly or ungodly? Depones and answers, "I stated before, that I understood Mr. Campbell to teach that men would be judged **B** according to their state—whether or not they had been brought into that character of God, which the work of Christ was calculated—was intended to bring them into—which character was a holy character.

Being interrogated, depones, that he thinks he has heard Mr. **C** Campbell teach concerning the redemption of all men by Christ—which deponent certainly did not understand to mean, a redemption from the obligation to obey God, nor a redemption from the judgment of Christ, to come: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell use expressions similar to **D** "Redeemed from all iniquity." Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell applied them to believers, or to all men? Depones and answers, to all men, if I understand the question. Being interrogated whether, when deponent says, that he has heard Mr. Campbell apply to all men, expressions **E** similar to "redeemed from all iniquity," deponent means, "redeemed from all iniquity, and purified unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works?" Depones and answers, that deponent does not understand the question. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all **F** men were, in point of fact, a peculiar people purified unto Christ and zealous of good works? Depones and answers, surely not. Being-interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean, in applying to all men such expressions as "redeemed from all iniquity?" Depones and **G** answers, simply that the sins of all men were forgiven in the work of Christ. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men who do not believe in Christ are or are not under the power of sin or iniquity? Depones and answers, that they are. Being interrogated whether Mr.

Campbell taught that any man who had not the Son, had or A  
had not life? Depones and answers, that he had not life.  
Being interrogated wherein Mr. Campbell taught that this  
life consists? Depones and answers, in his receiving the  
testimony of God in Christ. Being interrogated whether  
Mr. Campbell taught that it consisted in this alone? B  
Depones and answers, that deponent remembers Mr. Camp-  
bell to have said, that God had imbodyed his truth in a  
word, which is the gospel, and that in receiving this, a man  
received also the Spirit, who was given him in Christ.

Depones that deponent was present on the Sunday of the C  
sacrament at Row, in July 1830, and as deponent also thinks,  
on the previous Sunday, and heard Mr. Campbell fence the  
tables at the sacrament. Being interrogated whether depon-  
ent heard Mr. Campbell debar or forbid any from coming to  
the table of the Lord? Depones and answers, yes, depon- D  
ent thinks he must. Being interrogated how Mr. Campbell  
did so? Depones, that he cannot speak as to particular  
expressions—but just as it is usually done to those that are  
living ungodly lives. Being interrogated whether deponent .  
recollects to have heard Mr. Campbell teach regarding self- E  
examination, on that or the previous Sunday? Depones  
and answers, that deponent cannot charge his memory with  
any particular statements which Mr. Campbell made on that  
subject. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell repre-  
sented self-examination previous to partaking of the supper, F  
as confined to believers? Depones and answers, I cannot  
recollect.

Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught the assur-  
ance of faith to be? Depones and answers, an assurance  
resting upon the free gift of God, to all men in Christ—the G  
gift of the forgiveness of sin to all men in Christ. Being  
interrogated what he has heard Mr. Campbell teach the  
assurance of salvation to be? Depones and answers, an  
assurance resting on the promise of God. Being interrogated

**A** whether Mr. Campbell taught that the faith of a regenerate person might or might not be at times suspended or inactive? Depones and answers, yes, I think he taught that it might—that it might be clouded. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that any relation subsisted in a regenerate **B** person, between the continuance of his faith, and the continuance of his assurance? Depones and answers, I do not remember to have heard Mr. Campbell particularly on that subject—but he taught that there could not be a continuance of assurance, without a continuance of the exercise of faith—**C** that the exercise of the one depended upon the exercise of the other.

Interrogated by the libellers, whether in fencing the tables at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in July, 1830, Mr. Campbell did or did not debar from the ordinance all who **D** had not an assurance of their own salvation? Depones, that he did not debar any such from the ordinance—but said that they could not derive benefit from it or worthily partake of it: Depones, that deponent thinks that on that occasion or on the Sunday preceding, Mr. Campbell enjoined the duty **E** of self-examination—but he cannot recollect any particulars, —and being interrogated whether he can state what it was that Mr. Campbell enjoined the people to examine themselves upon or about? Depones, that he cannot remember any particulars. Being interrogated whether he has heard Mr. **F** Campbell teach any thing to this effect, “that the blessing of life in Christ is coextensive with the curse, and belongs to all upon whom the curse has passed?” Depones, that he does not recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell use these expressions, but he has heard him teach that God has given eternal **G** life to all in Christ, but that it depended upon their receiving it or not, whether they had it: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach, that in consequence of the death of Christ the sins of every individual were pardoned, and that no man could come to Christ without knowing that his sins

were pardoned. Being interrogated whether he has heard A Mr. Campbell teach that assurance of salvation was essential to the faith of the gospel? Depones, that he has not heard Mr. Campbell so teach regarding assurance of salvation, but that assurance of the truth of the testimony of God in Christ, as applicable to the man himself, was essential to the faith of B the gospel. Being interrogated whether he has heard Mr. Campbell teach that the man who had not the assurance, now spoken of, made God a liar, and was not in a state of grace? Depones, that he thinks that the statement which Mr. Campbell made on this subject was, that the man who C did not believe that God had given to him eternal life in Christ made God a liar.

Re-interrogated for the defender, whether Mr. Campbell taught that a regenerate person was, while not exercising faith, making God a liar? Depones, certainly not. That it D is in the rejection of that declaration of God that a man makes God a liar.

Interrogated by Dr. Graham: Has deponent heard Mr. Campbell describe the pardon or forgiveness of sin, as being expressed by the scriptural language, of God's blotting out E sin—or of God saying, "Your sins and your iniquities I will remember no more?" Depones, that the deponent has not heard Mr. Campbell so speak. Being interrogated, depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to have taught that by pardon all sin is blotted out. Being interrogated whether the F deponent recollects Mr. Campbell having used the term "justification" as expressing God's act of "pardoning sin? Depones, that deponent is not sure that Mr. Campbell has used the term—but has stated that all are fully and freely forgiven. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught when a G person repented and believed in Christ, God did after that perform the act of pardoning his sin? Depones and answers, that God had pardoned his sin before repentance, and then the sinner by faith receives this benefit, meaning thereby that

A pardon that had been passed after the fall of Adam. Being interrogated whether deponent has heard Mr. Campbell use the term "justification?" Depones that he does not recollect: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell pray during divine service for the forgiveness of sin, but does not precisely recollect the language used. Being interrogated when Mr. Campbell prayed for the forgiveness of sin, he understood him to pray that God would blot out our sins? Depones and answers, yes—not with reference to the feeling that God has not forgiven sin, but as sin must be hateful to God, the mind of God is not changed at all in reference to sin, and therefore the believer must feel that every sin is grieving to the Spirit of God, and must therefore ask forgiveness of sin. And deponent would add, in reference to his understanding of Mr. Campbell's meaning in his prayers for the forgiveness of sin, that the great purpose of God in exhibiting his character, in the atonement by Christ, being to bring men into his own character, the believer, feeling that sin was marring that work, must therefore cry to God for forgiveness of sin. Being interrogated, can the deponent condescend upon any particular sin for the pardon of which he heard Mr. Campbell pray during divine service? Depones and answers, "I think the sin of sowing to the flesh," by which he understood Mr. Campbell to mean that a believer must in every act of his life be sowing either to the flesh or spirit; and that whenever he is not sowing to the spirit he is sowing to the flesh: Depones, that deponent has certainly heard Mr. Campbell press sinners to come to Christ. Interrogated, has he heard Mr. Campbell direct sinners to pray for an interest in Christ? Depones and answers, no, I have not. Interrogated, has the deponent heard Mr. Campbell instruct sinners to pray for deliverance from the wrath to come? Depones and answers, he has not. Interrogated whether the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell instruct sinners to pray at all? Depones and answers, I think so. Being interrogated whether deponent

can condescend upon what he has heard Mr. Campbell instruct sinners to pray for? Depones and answers, "That God would open their hearts to receive the testimony of God concerning Christ."

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton: Whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell tell his hearers for what sins they were to repent? Depones and answers, that they were to repent of the great sin of unbelief of the testimony of God concerning his forgiving love, and that the whole of men's sins were the acting of unbelief. Being interrogated what account did Mr. Campbell give of God's views of sin in his work in Christ, by which he removed the barrier betwixt himself and sinners? Depones and answers, the same act by which God forgave sin, testified his hatred of it in the shedding of the blood of his Son. Being interrogated, has the deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell in his preaching use the term "barrier" as referring to the pardon of sin? Depones and answers, yes, I think so—but I find a difficulty in discriminating, in reference to this answer, betwixt what I have heard and what I have read of Mr. Campbell's sermons. Being interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach concerning the number of those for whom the Holy Spirit is given in Christ? Depones, that he has already answered this question—which answer was as follows—"God has imbodyed his truth in a word which is the gospel, and that in receiving this a man received also the Spirit, who was given him in Christ." Being interrogated did the deponent hear Mr. Campbell teach that the Spirit in Christ was equally given to all? Depones and answers, I have heard Mr. Campbell repeatedly state that provision was made for all, in Christ, alike. Being interrogated if the deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach, why, since provision was made for all in Christ alike, all did not equally receive salvation? Depones and answers, because all would not receive this provision—because they loved darkness rather than light, their deeds being evil.



**A** And depones, that those who are brought from this love of darkness to receive the provision in Christ are so by the Spirit of God—but did not hear him explain why it was that the Spirit was given to one, and withheld from another.

Interrogated by Mr. Gregor, whether deponent has  
**B** heard Mr. Campbell teach that all sinners, without exception, may obtain the Holy Spirit, in a sense, and to a degree that will enable them to receive God's testimony concerning his love to men in Christ? Depones and answers, that deponent did not hear Mr. Campbell make a particular statement

**C** of that description—but generally he stated that all things are done on the part of God—that it is a finished work for all men—and that they who receive, by faith, the testimony of God in Christ, receive eternal life. Being interrogated, has deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach that the believers

**D** of God's testimony concerning his Son, receive the Holy Spirit in the act of believing? Depones and answers, yes, I think so. Being interrogated, has deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach any thing respecting the agency of the sinner independently of the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the

**E** act of believing? Depones and answers, I think that Mr. Campbell taught that the sinner, in receiving, has done so by the power of God, recognising the provision that is made for him in Christ—and that deponent might illustrate Mr. Campbell's teaching with regard to this, by referring to the

**F** case of the man with the withered hand. He was commanded to stretch out his hand, and in this command he recognised the provision of power to stretch out his hand, because the service of God was a reasonable service—and yet if he had been asked did you stretch out your hand by

**G** your own power, he would have answered certainly not. The sinner recognises the provision, and in so recognising it he obtains the power—but still it is the power of God. Being interrogated, whether deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach that before recognising the provision spoken of,

the sinner must be in possession of such a measure of the A Holy Spirit as to enable him to exercise this recognition ? Depones and answers, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell distinctly teach the doctrine of election, and also the revealed will of God for the conduct of man—but did not hear them reconciled by Mr. Campbell further than deponent has stated B in an answer already given—except that it is with the revealed will of God to men that they had chiefly to do, while they were bound to believe what God had declared concerning election. Being interrogated, has deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach that a sinner was wholly *passive* in regard C to his own salvation ? Depones and answers, that he has not heard him so teach. Being interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell teach that a sinner is in any sense and in any degree *active* in regard to his own salvation ? Depones and answers, that deponent thinks that question has D been already answered—at least he is not prepared to answer in any other way than he has already—and that the answer which the deponent refers to, is that in which deponent introduced the illustration of the case of the man with the withered hand. Being interrogated, did deponent during the time E libelled hear Mr. Campbell teach any thing in regard to the mind of the Spirit in such texts of scripture as the following, viz. “ Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling —Strive to enter in at the strait gate ?” Depones and answers, I could not speak expressly to that point. Being interro- F gated whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach that a sinner can receive the testimony of God without the agency of the Holy Spirit ? Depones and answers, no.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot : Whether deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell give an account of what the gospel is ? G Depones and answers, yes—that he has referred to the statement in Luke, “ I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people ;” and that Mr. Campbell taught that these good tidings literally extended to every human being

**A** without exception—and consisted in a message of pardon to every human being. Being interrogated, whether did Mr. Campbell, at any time, during the period libelled, teach, that this pardon consisted in any thing else but the removal of the barrier between God and the sinner? Depones and answers, I think not. Being interrogated, whether the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the deeds and the condition of those judged, are separated at the day of judgment? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that the deeds, which are all the actings of unbelief, are all forgiven—yet, that if the purpose of God should not be effected with the sinner, in bringing him out of his sinful into a holy state, then those very deeds would prove the condition in which he would then be remaining. Being interrogated whether the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach that the sins of men being fully and freely pardoned, will be remembered no more? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that God was perfectly sincere in declaring that he had freely and fully forgiven the sins of all men for the sake of Christ, and they will be remembered no more as a ground of E condemnation—but that they will be remembered as an evidence of condition.

Interrogated by Mr. Story : Depones, that he did not hear Mr. Campbell teach that any feeling, or any action, could be acceptable to God before regeneration : Depones, that Mr. F Campbell taught, that regeneration was contemporaneous with the entrance of the Holy Spirit into the soul : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the successive actings of unbelief, during the dispensation of grace, aggravated the moral debasement of the creature, but still, that the forgiveness of G each successive acting was as free as ever, and the way to the bosom of God as open to the sinner as ever. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the connexion of godly sorrow with repentance? Depones and answers, he taught that a believer must grieve over all sin—his own sin,

and the sin of the world. Being interrogated, whether Mr. A Campbell taught that a sense of sin was, or was not connected with believing the gospel? Depones and answers, certainly that it was: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that an assurance of God's love, so far from diminishing the jealousy and watchfulness of the believer, would increase them: B Depones, that it was the substance of Mr. Campbell's teaching, that it was the believer's duty to pray continually for power and wisdom, by which to walk in the way of God's commandments—and that a believer could not, from the assurance of God's love, suppose that he could do any thing C without that power and wisdom—and that a believer could in no way work out his salvation, except by continually receiving power from God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man was inexcusable for continuing in unbelief. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the D power of faith in changing the mind? Depones, that he taught that the work of God in Christ is recognised by the sinner, in the act of faith—and that this forgiving love, when believed, overcomes the enmity of the sinner's heart, when he sees God in earnest, in desiring his return to him. E

Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that there was no other way of discovering the love of God, but by referring to his record. Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the changed condition of a man, by believing the gospel, is a manifestation of God's love. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell F taught that the sins, over which a believer was to mourn, should lead him to doubt of the love of God, or to hold fast his confidence in order to be delivered from them? Depones and answers, certainly the latter.

Interrogated by Mr. Sym: Depones, that Mr. Campbell G taught that the promise, of which Mr. Campbell spoke, as rested upon in the assurance of salvation, is the promise of eternal blessedness; and that Mr. Campbell set this promise in contradistinction to a mere prediction, inasmuch, as a pro-

A mise supposes our trusting in God for the fulfilment of it, in every step leaning on him, which would not be the case with a mere prediction. Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that this promise is made to all—but that the believer only receives it, and has the assurance arising from so doing : De-  
 B pones, that while Mr. Campbell taught, that the assurance of faith was necessary to the assurance of salvation, deponent does not think that he taught that the assurance of salvation was necessary to the assurance of faith.

Re-interrogated for defender : Being interrogated whe-  
 C ther deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach, in speaking to, or of unbelievers, that as long as they remained so, and did not repent, they were exposed, or liable to the wrath of the Lamb at his coming ? Depones and answers, unquestionably : De-  
 pones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that the pardon of all men  
 D includes the gift of the Spirit to all, in Christ, inasmuch as that gift is contained in the gospel preached to all men, through the atonement : Depones, that Mr. Campbell made a distinction between the gift of the Spirit to all men, and the possession of the Spirit by a man ; inasmuch as it was one  
 E thing for God to give, and another thing for man to receive : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that it was sinful for a regenerate person to be without assurance, alike, of faith and salvation : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that an unbeliever could not have any right sorrow for, or conviction of  
 F sin, and that because he had not the mind of God in the matter.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of a regenerate person is clouded by sin or temptation ? Depones and answers, that deponent  
 G never heard Mr. Campbell teach whether the clouding of assurance proceeded in a regenerate person, from sin, or from temptation ; but understands the question, which he thus answers, to be different from the question already answered by deponent, whether Mr. Campbell taught that it was a sin-

ful thing in a regenerate person to be in the state of having A his assurance so clouded. All which is truth, as deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) JOHN BARCLAY.

Captain JAMES STIRLING, of Glentyne, R.N. parish of B Kilbarchan, Presbytery of Paisley, aged about forty-one years, married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent first heard Mr. Campbell deliver a discourse about the middle of September, 1829, in the parish of Row; and has heard Mr. C Campbell frequently, both in his own parish and elsewhere, between that period and September, 1830: Depones, that the subject of the first discourse above mentioned was the Jailor of Philippi: Depones, that from the discourses which deponent has heard Mr. Campbell deliver since that time and D during the time libelled, he has learned to understand the import of Mr. Campbell's statements in that first discourse, in reference to the doctrine of universal atonement. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught in the discourses subsequently delivered by him regarding the doctrine of E universal atonement? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that prayer and supplication be made for all men, for it is good and acceptable in the sight of our God and Father, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, for there is one God and one F Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. That Mr. Campbell taught, in addressing every individual apart, that he is authorized in the name of God to declare unto him that the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ was shed G for him: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach concerning Christ as the propitiation for sin. Being interrogated in what terms Mr. Campbell so taught? Depones, that he taught those addressed that Christ was a propitiation

**A** not for their sins only, but for the sins of the whole world. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught to be God's object or intention in Christ having given himself a ransom for all? Depones, that he taught that God was not imputing unto them their sins, therefore, that through the forgiveness **B** of their sins they might be brought into peace with God—that they might serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness continually: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach that the above intention was capable of being defeated. Being interrogated how Mr. Campbell stated that **C** that intention might be defeated? Depones and answers, by disbelief. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught was the condition of those who disbelieved? Depones and answers, I have heard Mr. Campbell state it in the words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. viz. “That God was in Christ not im-  
**D** putting their trespasses unto them,” and therefore beseeching them to return to him. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught would be the ultimate condition of those who so disbelieved? Depones and answers, an eternity of misery.

Being interrogated whether when Mr. Campbell taught **E** that Christ had given himself a ransom for all men, deponent understood him to teach that he had delivered all men from his own judgment? Depones and answers, I never heard Mr. Campbell say that any act of God could make the creature independent of him, but that his forgiveness had always  
**F** reference to a judgment to come, to be exercised by the Son, to whom God had committed all judgment, because he was the Son of man. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught Christ's being the Son of man as the reason why God had committed all judgment to him? Depones and answers,  
**G** that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell speak on the subject, showing the goodness of God in it that we have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and that thus we are not called to be judged by one who would judge unrighteous judgment: Depones, that Mr.

Campbell taught that Christ was the Redeemer of all men; A that he had redeemed them from all their iniquities, meaning thereby that he redeemed them from the guilt of sin, and had made provision for them whereby they might overcome all sin. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught was the redemption of all men from the guilt of sin? Depones, that B he taught that man being a sinner could not enter into the presence of God, but that through the shedding of Christ's blood a way was opened into the holiest, that every man might stand in his presence without fear—but all men were not now so standing, because those who do not believe what C God has done for them cannot enter into the presence of God without trembling. Being interrogated what was the provision which Christ had made for all men that they might overcome all sin? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that Christ having ascended up on high, and having received gifts D for men—even the Holy Spirit—men had, in him, all things pertaining to life and godliness; and that man was without excuse for not standing in God's presence without fear.

Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were members of Christ's body? Depones, that he E taught that he who is in Christ Jesus is a new creature; therefore the man who is not born again, cannot be a member of Christ's body. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men had the Holy Spirit in them? Depones and answers, no. Being interrogated whether deponent F heard Mr. Campbell teach, that all men had an interest in Christ? Depones and answers, yes—for all men have been redeemed by his blood. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that that interest was dependent, or independent of their faith? Depones and answers, he taught G that, being the work of Christ, it is quite independent of them. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that any man could derive advantage from this interest in Christ, without faith? Depones, that, with respect to that,



A deponent heard Mr. Campbell quote that passage in Hebrews, which states, "if he that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses, of how much sorer punishment suppose ye, will he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing." Being interrogated what relation Mr. Campbell taught to exist between an unbeliever and the Holy Spirit? Depones and answers, that God, by his Spirit, which was given to every man in Christ Jesus, was striving with every man, seeking to enter in. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell represented the condition of an unbeliever, in reference to this striving of God, as an active or as a passive condition? Depones, that he taught that it was resisting the power of God, and frustrating his grace. Being interrogated on what ground Mr. Campbell taught that Christ, as the Son of man, would judge men at the last day? Depones and answers, that Christ would judge men, as those who had been forgiven their sins—as men who had been put in a situation to be brought out of their rebellion against God, into the possession of the mind of God; and that all who were found at that day not having the mind of God, would be condemned for ever. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught how it would be known, or declared in that day who had, and who had not the mind of God? Depones and answers, by their fruits ye shall know them. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that a man who saw the love of God to himself, but did not understand the love of God to the world, was or was not a regenerate person? Depones and answers, I do not know that I ever heard Mr. Campbell make any statement of that kind—but I have heard him teach that the only way of seeing the love of God to one's own soul, was seeing love to be the character of God, and seeing it to every fellow creature. Being interrogated whether, when Mr. Campbell spoke of the condem-

nation of any individual at the last day, he ascribed that condemnation to his rejection of God's love to himself, or to his not understanding the love of God to the world? Depones and answers, to the rejection of God's love to his own soul: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught concerning pardon, as applicable to all men—meaning thereby that God had forgiven them their sins, and was not imputing to them their trespasses.

Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, in the school-house at Helensburgh, in autumn, 1829, that the gospel to be preached to all men, was good tidings of great joy to all people; which tidings were, that a Saviour was born. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell stated the forgiveness of the sins of all men as a historical fact, or as a moral truth? Depones and answers, as a moral truth—which unless received, by the power of the Holy Spirit, into the soul, could not work the designed effect, viz. that he that believeth it has eternal life—and was not truly believed or understood where it did not produce this effect. That deponent has heard Mr. Campbell pray for the pardon or forgiveness of sin. Being interrogated what deponent then understood Mr. Campbell to pray for? Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell speak on that subject, when he stated, that the command to pray for forgiveness of sins was given to the disciples, as believers, and therefore that that prayer was presented in the sight of the truth, that God had put away our sins. That deponent does not know how Mr. Campbell reconciled the two things; but Mr. Campbell further stated, that no man could pray for that forgiveness, but one who knew that it had already passed upon him. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that an unbeliever could acceptably pray to God? Depones and answers, that he has heard Mr. Campbell state, that in unbelief it was impossible to approach God; as a man in unbelief was approaching, without a Mediator, to God, who had declared that there was no access to

- A him but through Jesus Christ. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell inculcated watchfulness and jealousy on believers? Depones and answers, certainly. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught about mourning for sin; in connexion with the belief of the gospel? Depones and answers, he taught that that man only, who knew that his sin was forgiven, saw in the ransom given for it the sinfulness of sin—that he only was in a condition to see and know his great guilt, in having committed it against a God of so much love, and thus mourn over it with a godly sorrow.
- C Being interrogated whether and what Mr. Campbell taught regarding sowing to the flesh and to the Spirit? Depones, that he taught that man was by nature sinful—that in his flesh was no good thing, and that, being continually tempted by the power of the flesh, he could only be restrained from
- D sin by the power of the Holy Ghost, and the strengthening of the new nature in him; and this in reference to believers alone, because none but believers had the Spirit in them, or were born again. Being interrogated, depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that no man in unbelief can obey God, but
- E that all men were under the obligation to obey God, both as their Creator and as their Redeemer: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that salvation was, as to the present, the healing of the soul, by its being brought from a state of sin to a state of peace with God; and as to the future, it was
- F eternal happiness in the presence of God: Depones, that in a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell at Paisley, within the time libelled, on being saved by hope, deponent heard Mr. Campbell draw a parallel between the hope of the Christian and the hope of a worldly man; showing, that while the
- G hope of the latter was mutable and uncertain, as resting on a created thing, which was in itself uncertain—the former being founded on the immutable truth and power of God, was fixed and sure. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught the assurance of faith to be? Depones, that he taught

that every man that believed the gospel must have an assurance, and be at peace with God ; and that one who believed not, was disbelieving the record, and making God a liar. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell stated the assurance of salvation to be ? Depones and answers, he taught that the assurance of future salvation arose out of the present knowledge of the character of God as forgiving the sins of the individual, and the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—and so having hope and confidence in God, and resting upon him, as set forth in these two passages, “acquaint thyself with God and be at peace,” and, “they that know thy name will put their trust on Thee.” Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man could be a regenerate person, yet be at times without the assurance of faith and that of salvation : Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that no man can be born of God and receive that life, without being aware of it—yet that Satan, and the world, and the flesh, may so overcome him, at times, as that he shall lose sight of the love of God to him, and be in darkness ; yet that it is true that God does love him, and has forgiven him, and that, as the elect of God, he cannot perish, but being born of God, has, and will inherit eternal life. And deponent would add, as Mr. Campbell’s teaching, that a regenerate person, when in such darkness, is not entitled to take any comfort to his soul, from considering that he once knew and had peace with God, and that he was an elect person ; because he can only have assurance of salvation through a present life, according to the language of St. Paul, “the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that such a state was sinful in a regenerate person ? Depones and answers, he taught that it was more particularly so, for a believer having once tasted that the Lord was gracious, thus to forsake his first love.

**A** Interrogated for the libellers: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach, that in consequence of the death of Christ, the sins of every individual were pardoned, whether he believed it or not, in the sense in which Scripture uses the term pardon, viz. that of not imputing sin to men, and that **B** their sin was put away; and that this included every species of sin—God reserving to himself the right of judgment, which is to be conducted on the principle of forgiveness, as stated in the first chapter of Luke, in the oath that he swore unto Abraham, “that, being delivered from the power of the **C** enemy, they might serve God without fear, in holiness and righteousness;” where this character is not produced there will be an unfitness for the dwelling with God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man cannot pray to God until he be a believer, as said in Romans, “How shall they **D** call on him whom they have not believed?” All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) JAMES STIRLING, R. N.

**E** ROBERT BAILLIE LUSK, Bookseller in Greenock, aged about thirty-three years, married, being solemnly sworn and examined, and purged of malice and partial council: Depones, that deponent has repeatedly heard Mr. Campbell deliver discourses between 7th September, 1829, and the 7th September, 1830, both in his own parish and elsewhere, and **F** has heard him preach on the subject of universal atonement and assurance: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell preach two or three sermons in the Floating Chapel at Greenock, and in particular one on Rev. xiv. 6, 7, in or about April, 1830: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught **G** in that sermon, that God had forgiven the sins of all men, the object of which, Mr. Campbell stated to be, that they might repent and give God glory—which if they did not do, they should be destroyed with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. Being interro-

gated whether Mr. Campbell taught this forgiveness of sin as **A** an historical fact, or as a moral truth, concerning God? Depones and answers, rather as the latter; and, that Mr. Campbell taught, that a man could not be saved by believing the fact, without understanding the moral truth. And that the moral truth contained in this forgiveness of sin, included no tolerance **B** of sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the condemnation being taken away, through the death of Christ, was the first thing needful for saying to any man, Repent and give God glory—that the second thing needful was that God should have been revealed or made known to man, which **C** also was done by the sacrifice of Christ—and the third thing needful was, that Christ should have the Holy Spirit for all men—and that under these three heads, as deponent thinks, he included all that was needful, in order that man might be called upon to do this. Being interrogated as to the reason **D** assigned by Mr. Campbell for these three things being needful? Depones, that deponent cannot, in regard to this question, distinctly distinguish between what he learned from that sermon, and from other discourses by Mr. Campbell—but that deponent knows that Mr. Campbell taught the **E** reason to be, 1st, that God could not admit man into his presence unless his sins had been put away—2d, that man could not look to God with confidence while he felt that the condemnation was resting upon him; and that he could render to God no free service of the heart, while under the **F** feeling of the necessity of doing something in order to get the forgiveness of his sins. That it was needful that God should be made known to man in the sacrifice of Christ, because man is naturally ignorant of God, and unless he know him, cannot give him glory; and that it was necessary **G** Christ should have the Spirit for men, before they could be called upon to glorify God, because the character of God being only spiritually discerned, man has, in himself, no capacity of seeing and understanding the character of God,

A even when revealed, and that he has, in himself, no strength wherein to draw near to God and serve him : which reasons, deponent believes, were preached, in substance, in the above-mentioned sermon. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, in that sermon, that we could conceive nothing B which we could ask of God, which he has not already given us? Depones and answers, something like that—but that does not contain the full meaning ; which, deponent thinks, Mr. Campbell expressed by saying, that God had given us, in Christ Jesus, all things pertaining to life and godliness—C that he had done all things, needful, *out* of us, and was ready to do all things *in* us, by his Spirit : Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that the right of Christ to judge men arose out of his having bought them—that God the Father might have judged men justly at any time—but that he thus spoke D of the right of Christ, the God-man, to judge men—which arose entirely out of his having bought or redeemed them. And, in illustrating the doctrine that God the Father might have rightly judged us, Mr. Campbell stated, that the sentence on Adam was a righteous sentence. Being interro- E gated, when Mr. Campbell taught that Christ had bought or redeemed all men, whether he taught that he had bought them *from* judgment, or bought them *for* judgment? Depones and answers, that he had bought them *for* judgment. Being interrogated, on what principle Mr. Campbell taught F that Christ would judge the men whom he had bought? Depones and answers, he taught that the end for which Christ had bought men was that they might be redeemed from all iniquity, and that, through walking in the Spirit, they might not fulfil any of the lusts of flesh ; and that G Christ would judge them according as this purpose had or had not been fulfilled in them. Being interrogated, in what way Christ would, at his judgment, manifest whether a man had been walking in the Spirit, or walking after the flesh? Depones and answers, he taught that Christ would judge

him according as his deeds had been: Depones, that Mr. A Campbell taught that the death of Christ, by which he had purchased all men, was God's greatest manifestation that he would ever condemn sin. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught that God desired men to come *from*, in desiring them to come to him? Depones and answers, from B sin: and that men, who did not come to God, would not do so, because they loved darkness rather than light, having their deeds evil: Depones, that it was not as God, but as God manifest in the flesh, that Mr. Campbell taught, that Christ had bought all men; and that from the curse of the C law, which was the Father's judgment, and that the judgment of the Father would not, as such, be revived: Depones, that the deponent's answers to the two or three last questions, have reference, not exclusively to the above mentioned sermon, but to Mr. Campbell's general teaching during the time D libelled.

Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that all men deserved condemnation, and were, by nature, under condemnation. That deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach two sermons in Paisley, in March 1830; the one upon Isaiah lvii. 15—the E other from Luke xiii. 1—9. That, in the first mentioned sermon, Mr. Campbell stated, in reference to godly sorrow for sin, that it was a pure sorrow *for sin*, not for the consequences of sin. That the provision made for man being contrite, and having a godly sorrow for sin, was contained in the F latter verses of the same chapter, particularly the 19th, and that it was the proclamation of peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, and the promise of God to heal him—to which the 2d chap. of Ephesians 14, to the end, is parallel—where it is declared, that Christ, having made peace G by the blood of his cross had come preaching peace—and that the peace first made, and then preached, by Christ, and which was the full provision for making men contrite, was particularly contained in the 11th verse of that chapter, “for



- A through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." That Mr. Campbell taught, in that sermon, that unbelievers could certainly not have a right sorrow for sin, or any sorrow for sin, *as sin*—and that God could dwell with that man only who had a *godly* sorrow for sin; Depones,
- B that, in that sermon, Mr. Campbell explained his meaning, in speaking of the removal of the barrier between God and the sinner, by saying, that it was contained in the verse above mentioned, which taught that every man, notwithstanding of his sin, had now, in consequence of Christ's death, access
- C unto the Father by one Spirit, through Christ; and deponent frequently heard Mr. Campbell teach, that the above was just what he meant, when he said that all men were pardoned; and that he did not mean thereby any ultimate security from wrath.
- D Depones, that at the time of the sacrament at Row, in July, 1830, deponent was residing in the parish, and was present, both on the Sacrament Sunday, and on that preceding it. That on the latter day, Mr. Campbell's text was, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink
- E of that cup," which text he taught was addressed to believers: and that the purpose there recommended, was to ascertain the fitness of their condition, at the time, to sit down at the table of the Lord, and not to ascertain whether they were believers or not: and that the examination, there-
- F in recommended, was, whether they had right views of what was set forth in the ordinance, and were coming to it with right feelings—and that the right views were a response in the heart of the believer to what was said to him in the words, "This is my body broken *for you*." That in illus-
- G trating the nature of this self-examination, Mr. Campbell referred to 2 Cor. xiii. 5, "Examine yourselves whether you be in the faith," which Mr. Campbell said related to examination for a different purpose from that contained in the text—which different purpose was, that the Corinthian converts,

among whom, it appeared, that a doubt as to Paul's apostle- A  
ship had arisen, might, by seeing that they themselves were  
in the faith, have a proof that Christ had spoken in him ; and  
was the same as that in the passage, " If I be not an apostle  
unto others, yet doubtless I am to you for the seal of mine  
apostleship are ye in the Lord." B

Depones, that in Mr. Campbell's address, at the close of  
the tables, he said a great deal about Christian experience.  
That Mr. Campbell divided those of his hearers who had  
been at the table, into three classes—those who had then met  
the Lord at his table—those who had not then done so, C  
though they had done so in times past, and those who had  
never known what it was to meet the Lord at his table :  
Depones, that Mr. Campbell then stated a connexion between  
the fruits of faith and assurance ; and that, although a man's  
assurance did not spring from seeing any fruits of faith in him- D  
self, yet it could not be maintained where these fruits were  
not : and he also taught, that the more closely a man walked  
with God, the more he knew of God's love to himself. Being  
interrogated how Mr. Campbell taught that a man's know-  
ledge of the love of God to himself was increased by his E  
walking more closely with God ? Depones and answers, just  
as a man had more experience of the kindness of a friend,  
the more intercourse he had with him. That when Mr.  
Campbell taught as above, regarding the connexion between  
the maintenance of assurance, and the existence of the fruits F  
of faith, Mr. Campbell referred to both the assurance of faith  
and the assurance of salvation—meaning, in that instance, by  
the assurance of salvation, assurance of a future salvation.

Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach a sermon  
at Row about the beginning of July 1830, in which he G  
stated that all men had an accursed life in or through Adam  
—and that in like manner all men had a life given to them  
in Christ. That Mr. Campbell did not teach that all men  
were in Christ—and he then taught that, while men had no

A choice as to their possession of the life received from Adam, they had a choice whether they would or would not possess the life given to them in Christ.

Depones, that in the visitation sermon preached by Mr. Campbell, he stated it, generally, as indispensable to the character of a Christian that he should possess the characters therein described from the text; and that he should know that God has had mercy on him, and has forgiven him. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell in that, or in any other sermon heard by deponent, stated it as indispensable to a man's being a Christian, that he should always be recognising God's mercy and forgiveness to him? Depones, that he does not remember as to that sermon—but has heard Mr. Campbell repeatedly state, that, in point of fact, it was not *necessarily* the condition of the Christian to be always in that state, and that the Christian might fall into unbelief as well as into any other sin,—in which case, and at which time, it was impossible that the Christian could have assurance of faith, and assurance of salvation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has frequently taught the gospel to be, E “that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses, and beseeching them, therefore, to be reconciled unto God; and, also, that the gospel meant the declaration, that God would judge the world, in righteousness, *by Jesus Christ*,—and, therefore, F commanded all men to repent:” Depones, that, in the visitation sermon, Mr. Campbell taught, that in order to be a peace-maker, a man must know that Christ had shed his blood for men; because he only could beseech them to be reconciled unto God,—and the measure of God's love to all G men was to be seen in the agonies of the Son of God. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught, that an unbeliever would, at the judgment of Christ, be condemned for not understanding God's love to the world, or for rejecting God's love to himself? Depones and answers, for rejecting God's

love to himself,—although, while deponent understood Mr. A Campbell to teach this, he does not remember to have heard him make the distinction; because he understood him to teach, that no man saw God's love to himself, but in seeing the love of God to the world. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that a man who, by the B Spirit of God, saw God's love to himself, but did not understand the truth of God's love to all men, was or was not a regenerate person? Depones and answers, I always heard him say that every man who was taught of the Spirit of God to see God's love to himself, was a regenerate person. C

Depones, that he has frequently heard Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness, or pardon of sins—and understood him, in doing so, just to pray for the forgiveness of sins, but not for the removal of the barrier between God and the sinner. Being interrogated whether, in so praying, Mr. Campbell D prayed, as deponent understood, for deliverance from Christ's judgment to come—meaning, by that, a prayer that he might not come into condemnation at the last day? Depones and answers, yes; but not so as doubting whether the prayer would be answered or not. Being interrogated, whether it E was a prayer to be preserved from falling into condemnation, or a prayer to be delivered from an everlasting condemnation? Depones and answers, the former.

Depones, that deponent has never heard Mr. Campbell teach unbelievers to pray for, or seek an interest in Christ: F Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell state this as the reason for not doing so, that to tell unbelievers to seek an interest in Christ, was to tell them to go to God for a Mediator, and therefore to go to God *without* a Mediator: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach concerning the G office of Christians in filling up the sufferings of Christ, meaning thereby, in substance, that they partook of the same feelings with him; but surely not that the sufferings of Christ's people in any way filled up the efficacy of his

A atonement: Depones, that the connexion taught, by Mr. Campbell, to exist between the assurance of faith and the assurance of future salvation, was this, that while a regenerate man was in the state of having an assured faith, he would also have, at the same time, the assurance of future salvation: and that the principle on which this connexion rested was, that the man who assuredly believed what God had revealed of himself, knew that which made him confidently depend upon God for salvation, according to that word, "They that know thy name will put their trust in thee,"—

C but that Mr. Campbell did not teach, that while a man had not the assurance of his future salvation, he was *necessarily* a child of the devil, and an unbeliever; yet that he, of whom that was true *at all times*, was an unbeliever.

Being interrogated, to what Mr. Campbell ascribed the D fact, that some men had, and other men had not the Spirit of God, enabling them to believe the gospel? Depones and answers, he ascribed that difference to the eternal election of the Father, and that those who believed were made willing in a day of his power.

E Interrogated for the libellers, whether the words found relevant in the first head of the libel, regarding the sermon preached in the Floating Chapel at Greenock, were actually used by Mr. Campbell in that sermon—the first charge of the libel, in so far as found relevant, being now, with consent of defender, shown to the witness? Depones, that the said words, or others substantially of the same import, were employed by Mr. Campbell in the said sermon: And the witness, with the same consent, being, likewise, shown the words, in the tenth head of the libel, which have been G found relevant, depones, that these words were employed, or others of substantially the same meaning, though the want of connexion renders the meaning of them not very certain.

Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, in the sermon preached on the Sunday preceding the dispensa-

tion of the Lord's Supper, in July, 1830, that no man A whatever was in a fit state to partake of that ordinance who had not a present belief that Christ died for him.

Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught, in the sermon preached at the Presbyterial visitation, that the love of God, to every individual of Adam's family, was equal, or B according to the agonies of the Son of God? Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not use these expressions, but what he said was of the same import; and the deponent adds, that he thinks he gave the very expressions when examined in chief. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer C to God.

(Signed) R. B. LUSK.

ALEXANDER M'AUSLAN, Farmer at Kirkmichael, parish of Row, aged about thirty, married, being solemnly sworn, D examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent is a parishioner of Row, and attends in the church there generally, though not every Sunday, and did so during the time libelled.

Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach the E visitation sermon in July 1830, which, as deponent thinks, was like his ordinary sermons. That, in that sermon, Mr. Campbell spoke on the character of a peace-maker. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell said on that subject? Depones and answers, that he cannot give the very words— F but it was something like this—that he bore the character of a peace-maker who knew the love of God in Christ Jesus to himself: Depones, that deponent does not recollect that Mr. Campbell spoke of the way in which the love of God was to be measured, or about the agonies or sufferings of G Christ: nor can deponent say positively whether, in that sermon, Mr. Campbell stated what was necessary to make a Christian.

Depones, that within the year libelled deponent has heard

A Mr. Campbell speak of a blessing belonging to all men in reference to Christ—which blessing, meaning thereby the blessing of the Spirit which was in Christ for all men, Mr. Campbell explained to be, that as Christ had bled and died on the cross for them, and had ascended up on high, he had received B gifts for them, that the Lord might dwell among them.

That Mr. Campbell taught that Christ had life in him for all men: that Mr. Campbell did not teach that a man who had not come to Christ had life: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that, because Christ had the Spirit for all men, C they should glorify God in the Spirit given to them in Christ, walking in the light of his love: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has spoken of pardon and the forgiveness of sin—but deponent does not recollect Mr. Campbell's explanation of it so well as to be able to express it in words. That he

D taught that all men had access to God—which access they had got through Christ—and this deponent understands as explaining Mr. Campbell's meaning in regard to pardon.

That all men were not making use of that access—and that those who never made use of it would go to eternal

E perdition: Depones, that deponent has not exactly heard Mr. Campbell use the word assurance. That deponent never heard Mr. Campbell say that a man was a Christian who did not know that God was loving him. That Mr.

Campbell has said that a Christian might at times doubt F that God was loving him—and deponent always understood Mr. Campbell to say that it was a wrong thing for a believer to doubt God's love to him: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught unbelievers that in continuing in sin they were shutting out the love of God to themselves—and never heard Mr.

G Campbell say that they could have any true peace away from God. That the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell speak of a false peace, and say that it was a peace which this world gave—and understood Mr. Campbell to tell unbelievers that if they lived and died in the condition of

shutting out God's love to them, it would be an awful re- A  
cognition to them at the day of judgment.

That Mr. Campbell, generally, at the end of his sermon, applied the subject on which he had been speaking—in which application he always made distinctions among his hearers, into believers and unbelievers. And depones that Mr. B Campbell applied his subject to believers, sometimes in a re-proving way, for their coming short, and sometimes in a comforting way, to establish them in the faith—and applied it to unbelievers in a warning way. That he did not tell them, that the love of God was to comfort them, in remaining in C sin. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that it was necessary to know God, in order to be saved by believing in the pardon of one's sins? Depones and answers, I always understood Mr. Campbell to teach that all who come to God must believe that he is, and that he is the re- D warder of them that diligently seek him. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught, that a knowledge of the love of God would make a man think of sin? Depones and answers, I always understood Mr. Campbell to say that it would enable him to see it as a thing that was exceeding E sinful. That deponent does not recollect, whether Mr. Campbell taught, regarding the way in which unbelievers see sin. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that a man could believe God's love in his own strength? Depones and answers, I never heard him teach so—but he F always taught, that a man could not come to God, unless he was drawn by him, and that a man must see something in God to make him come to him. Depones, that Mr. Campbell always taught, that where sin was, God hated it, whether in believers or in unbelievers. That deponent never heard Mr. G Campbell say, that unbelievers would perform any thing acceptably in the sight of God. But that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell say to them to go to God, in the spirit of prayer, and ask of him to teach them what they should do.



A Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught, in regard to an interest in Christ? Depones, that the substance of it was, that there was life in Christ for every man : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the sins of all men, whether they believed or not, were now forgiven through the death B of Christ. That God was in Christ, not imputing to them their trespasses : But did not understand Mr. Campbell to teach, that all men were saved, whether they believed or not.

Interrogated for the libellers : Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell divide his hearers, into those who believed C the love of God to their souls, and those who did not believe it—and has heard him state, that those who did not believe this love to themselves, were resisting the love of God : Depones, that the deponent was present at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper at Row, in July last. That Mr. Camp- D bell, in fencing the tables on that occasion, forbade or warned certain classes not to partake of the ordinance. That he cannot say positively, whether Mr. Campbell used the word 'debar,' but he does not recollect of his having done so. That he understood Mr. Campbell then to have said, that a E man ought not to partake of that ordinance, unless he came there to commemorate the love of God as a love to himself.

Being re-interrogated for the defender, whether, when Mr. Campbell taught, that it was possible for a Christian to doubt the love of God to him at times, he taught that at these F times the Christian was resisting that love? Depones and answers, he taught that whatever of doubt was in him was sin, and that there was no reason, on God's part, why he should doubt.

Interrogated by Mr. Story : Depones, that Mr. Campbell G taught that the *something* which a man must see in God, in order to come to him, is the love of God, in the gift of his Son : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that which prevents a man from going to God, is a shutting out of God's love, and a distrust of God in his own heart, and not know-

ing God's true character; and that a man can never go to A God, without being convinced of his own sinfulness. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught as to how a man, convinced of sinfulness, can go to God without fear, seeing God is a holy God? Depones and answers, by looking at God in the face of Jesus Christ, or as his reconciled Father B in Jesus Christ. Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that there would always be in a believer a grief for his own sins, and the sins of others. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) ALEX. M'AUSLAN. C

JOHN M'GLASHAN, Teacher in Helensburgh, aged about twenty years, unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent attends Mr. Campbell's church, but not regularly, D as he cannot walk so far. That deponent thinks he has heard Mr. Campbell deliver discourses within the time libelled, both in church, and in the school-house at Helensburgh: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell on every occasion but one whenever he preached in the school- E house at Helensburgh—that on that occasion he preached about two o'clock in the day, and it was in summer or harvest, 1829. And being interrogated whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach a sermon in the school-house at Helensburgh on the text "Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no F physician there?" Depones, that deponent does not remember such a text, or the words of the sermon preached on that text: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that God loved every man—and that that love of God arose from something in God—not in man. Being interrogated whe- G ther Mr. Campbell taught that God would punish the wicked? Depones and answers, I always understood him to teach that God would punish those who rejected his love—which love was seen in the gift of Christ. That Mr. Camp-

- A** bell taught that God's intention in the gift of Christ was that he might be a sacrifice for the world. Being interrogated what benefit Mr. Campbell taught that all men derived from the sacrifice of Christ? Depones and answers, he taught that the men who believed received eternal life. He taught
- B** that there was life in Christ for every man, which men received by faith. That Mr. Campbell taught that all men had access to God by the blood of Christ, but that deponent never heard him teach that all men made use of that access. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell did or did not
- C** teach that all men's sins were forgiven in consequence of the death of Christ, whether they were believers or unbelievers? Depones, that deponent cannot remember just now : Depones, that Mr. Campbell always taught that those who believed would be saved, and that those who did not believe
- D** would not be saved—understanding Mr. Campbell to teach by believing—the belief of the record which God had given of his Son—that is the record of the Bible : And those only who believed it had the Spirit of Christ. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that a man could be
- E** believing God's record who did not know God's character? Depones and answers, I never understood him to teach any thing like that : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught the effect of believing the gospel to be that the man would be a new creature, and would be changed, and that a man who believed
- F** in the Lord Jesus Christ would hate sin in a right way, and forsake it, which an unbeliever cannot do : Depones, that deponent never remembers Mr. Campbell to have said that a man who did not believe could hate sin : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the reason why sinners were
- G** punished was for not receiving the truth—that men were to be judged by the Son at the last day—but deponent does not remember to have heard him say why that judgment would be by the Son, nor of hearing him speak of the rule by which men would be judged at that day : Depones, that

Mr. Campbell taught that men were to see God's greatest A  
 hatred of sin in the Son of God—but does not recollect  
 hearing him say what it was in the Son. Being interrogated  
 whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were by nature  
 guilty before God? Depones and answers, I always under-  
 stood him to teach so, and that all men had sinned and come B  
 short of the glory of God. Being interrogated what Mr.  
 Campbell taught that believers should be sorry for? Depones  
 and answers, for the sin remaining in them; but deponent  
 does not recollect any thing more with regard to that; but  
 that he did not hear him teach that unbelievers could be C  
 sorry for sin: Depones, that deponent always heard Mr.  
 Campbell press the acceptance of the gospel upon unbeliev-  
 ers—that he always told them that Christ Jesus died for  
 them, and that they should come upon that ground, and that  
 if they did not come by Christ they could not be saved. D  
 That deponent does not recollect Mr. Campbell to have  
 stated any thing about seriousness or anxiety: Depones, that  
 deponent has heard Mr. Campbell speak of the sin of unbe-  
 lief—but does not remember at present what he said on the  
 subject: Depones, that deponent does not remember to have E  
 heard Mr. Campbell in regard to the showing forth of God's  
 holiness in the death of Christ.

Interrogated by the libellers: Depones, that he heard Mr.  
 Campbell in his sermons mention the pardon of sins, but  
 does not recollect what Mr. Campbell said on that subject. F  
 Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell in speaking of the  
 pardon of sins, enabled the witness to understand what was  
 to be the effect of pardon, according to Mr. Campbell's  
 teaching? Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell  
 in teaching regarding pardon, to teach that the barrier was G  
 taken away, and that there was a free access to God in  
 Christ for every man—and by the barrier deponent means  
 the barrier that we had incurred between us and God, so  
 that we durst not go to God. Being interrogated whether

A Mr. Campbell taught that all whose sins were pardoned would be saved? Depones and answers, I never heard him teach so.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man had no hand in his salvation. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding working out our salvation—in reference particularly to that text, “Work out your own salvation?” Depones and answers, that deponent does not understand the question. And the question being repeated, depones that he does not recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell on that subject: Depones, that deponent thinks he remembers to have heard Mr. Campbell press commandments from God upon believers, but cannot remember any of those commandments. And depones, that what Mr. Campbell pressed upon unbelievers, first, was to believe the testimony. And being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught that they were required to do, after believing the testimony? Depones, that he cannot remember.

Interrogated by Dr. Fleming: Depones, that deponent has, during his examination, been always speaking in reference to Mr. Campbell's teaching during the year libelled, and that in saying that *he understood* Mr. Campbell to teach so and so, he means that that was the way he took him up at the time: Depones, that deponent remembers some of the texts on which Mr. Campbell preached during that year, one of which was regarding the shepherds of Bethlehem in the 2d chap. of Luke: that deponent does not just now remember any of the heads into which Mr. Campbell divided any of his discourses during that year: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell say, that the gospel was good news.

G Being interrogated for the defender, what Mr. Campbell, in saying that the gospel was good news, stated these good news to be? Depones and answers, that this was the way in which the deponent took up Mr. Campbell on that subject, that if there was a house in which all the people were ill of

a mortal disease, and that there was one who kept the door, A and that somebody came and said to him that there was good news, he would ask what good news was it? and the answer would be, a cure which would cure you if you made use of it, not in any way but in the way which the document giving it revealed—but which, if not so used, would leave your dis- B ease to terminate in death—that the cure would not do them good whether they received it or not, but only if they received it. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) JOHN M'GLASHAN. C

PETER M'CALLUM, Clothier in Helensburgh, being examined by the Court *in initialibus*: declares, that he was present in the church of Row, on the Sabbath after the meeting 'of the Presbytery at the Bath's Inn, Helensburgh—does not D remember that Mr. Campbell said, in that sermon, that his doctrine had been there misrepresented or mistaken: or that Mr. Campbell had used any similar expressions. Being interrogated, whether declarant can charge his memory with Mr. Campbell having then said, "I now hasten to correct E some mistakes in regard to my doctrine made in Presbytery?" declares and answers, that he cannot. Interrogated, whether did all the members of the congregation, who usually remain to the close of the service, remain that Sabbath to the end of the sermon? Declares and answers, that he could not say: F Declares, that declarant heard some individuals withdrawing from the front seats of the gallery during the service,—but whether before or after the conclusion of sermon he cannot tell. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell said that some had mistaken him through ignorance? Declares and G answers, no. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell then gave such a view of his doctrine as would prevent mistakes regarding them in future? Declares and answers, he did. Being interrogated, whether he heard Mr. Campbell

A state that he had been represented in evidence, to have forbidden unbelievers to pray? Depones and answers, that he did not. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell alluded to the doctrines for which he was libelled, or to other doctrines?

Declares and answers, that he does not recollect to what doctrines he alluded. Interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell at other times, labouring to prevent or correct mistakes in regard to his doctrines? Declares and answers, that Mr. Campbell always labours to do so, when he knows or hears that his doctrines have been misunderstood. Being

C interrogated whether, in the sermon above mentioned, Mr. Campbell stated that his doctrines had been misunderstood by members of Presbytery or by witnesses? "No, not that I heard." Being interrogated whether, on occasion of the above sermon, Mr. Campbell appeared more anxious to prevent or

D correct mistakes than on other occasions? Declares and answers, "no." Being interrogated, whether there was any thing in the place occupied by declarant in church, which might prevent him distinctly hearing all the statements made in that sermon? Declares and answers, "nothing." Being

E interrogated whether declarant was so situated in the church as to see the persons sitting in the gallery seat belonging to Lord John Campbell? Declares and answers, "no." Interrogated whether, on that day, Mr. Campbell made any allusion to any proceedings going on, in reference to himself or

F his doctrines? Declares and answers, that he does not remember him to have done so. All which is truth.

(Signed) PETER M'CALLUM.

The said Peter M'Callum, aged about thirty-eight, married: G being now solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he has been in the parish of Row during the whole of Mr. Campbell's ministry: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach occasionally during the year libelled, and heard him state his doctrines re-

garding universal atonement and assurance—that he said that A Christ died for all men—had tasted death for every man, to put away the sins of all men—that he had redeemed all men—And depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell, when he taught that Christ had redeemed all men, to teach that all men had now the way of access opened unto God, B and were invited to return to God—and that the inability of men to do so, is that they *will not* return, and that they will not return because the carnal mind is enmity against God : And being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that there was any safety or salvation for men who would not re- C turn to God ? Depones and answers, “ no ; ” but that cursed is the man that departeth from the Lord and maketh flesh his arm, and blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord.

Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught regarding judgment to come. Being interrogated by what person of the God- D head that judgment is to be executed ? Depones and answers, he taught that Christ is to be the Judge, and the Judge of all men ; and that Christ is to judge them by the gospel—“ the word I have spoken unto you, shall judge you in the last day ; ” and that all men should be judged according to E the circumstances in which God has placed them by the gospel : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught the gospel to be, That God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life : That those who believe not shall be F condemned, and those who believe have everlasting life—That a man receives from God life, or everlasting life, when he believes the gospel. Being interrogated how Mr. Campbell taught that Christ would, at his judgment, show or declare who had and who had not believed the gospel ? De- G pones and answers, yes—take those mine enemies, who would not that I should reign over them, and bind them hand and foot, and cast them into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death—that the



A wicked are those enemies. Being interrogated if Mr. Campbell taught by what mark Christ would show who the wicked were at his judgment? Depones and answers, those who shall be found in their sins: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell use the word forgiveness, in reference

B to all men. That Mr. Campbell taught that all men were forgiven, and that deponent thereby understood him to teach that the blood of Christ being shed for all men, there is forgiveness in that blood for every man. But that Mr. Campbell did not thereby teach that all men were delivered from

C judgment to come. That Mr. Campbell taught that God, in inviting all men to return to him, was inviting them to return from their sins. And that in inviting them to return to him, it was to the enjoyment of himself. Being interrogated in what way Mr. Campbell taught that men were

D enabled to return to God? Depones and answers, by the Holy Ghost enabling them. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell urged unbelievers to return to God? Depones and answers, yes—he urged them to return to God by

E Christ, who is the way to the Father; and that he chiefly urged believers to abide in Christ, and that without Christ they can do nothing. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught was necessary to constitute a Christian? Depones and answers, yes—he that believeth the record, that God

F hath given us eternal life in Christ, hath eternal life abiding in him. That Mr. Campbell taught that God has given all men an interest in Christ—and deponent understood him, in so saying, to teach, that God having given Christ as the gift of his love to the world, he had given him to all men. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men had

G or had not the Son, and the life which is in him? Depones and answers, he distinctly taught that he that believeth not hath not the life in him: Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell teach unbelievers to pray for an interest in Christ. That Mr. Campbell assigned as his reason for

not teaching them to do so, that God had given all men an A interest in Christ; and deponent particularly remembers Mr. Campbell having taught, one day, that such a thing would be to go to God for a mediator, and that a mediator was the greatest thing, and that if men could obtain that without Christ, they could obtain any other thing. Being interro- B gated whether deponent has ever, during the time libelled, heard Mr. Campbell state what the assurance of faith was? Depones and answers, yes, he that believeth hath the witness in himself—which witness was the Spirit of God. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught as to the meaning of C salvation? Depones and answers, deliverance from sin. Being interrogated whether he represented it as a present or future thing, or both? Depones and answers, as a present thing—the instant a sinner believes, but yet to be completed in glory. Being interrogated whether a regenerate person D might, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, be at times tempted to doubt God's love to him? Depones and answers, he taught that he is often so tempted, and that it is his sin to yield to the temptation. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that a Christian was one who believes E God's love to himself, or that he was one who understood the doctrine of God's love to the world? Depones and answers, one who believes God's love to himself. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that saving faith consisted in the belief of the forgiveness of sin, accompanied F or unaccompanied with the knowledge of God's character? Depones and answers, he taught to know God is eternal life, and that no man who does not know God is safe: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that there was a manifestation of God's holiness in the death of Christ, and that there is also G such a manifestation in the proclamation of the forgiveness of sin; because God therein showed the way in which sins had been forgiven through the blood of Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that all those who know God,

A mourn for sin in themselves, and for sin in the world, and that no others did so.

Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness of sin. Being interrogated, what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to pray for in so praying? Depones and answers, for forgiveness of sins, because we glorify God so little, and live so little to God. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers could obey God? Depones and answers, he taught that whatsoever is not of faith is sin, and that no unbeliever, while he continues in unbelief, can obey God; but that unbelievers were bound to obey God. Being interrogated, what he directed them to do, in order that they might be in a condition to obey God? Depones and answers, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught, that regenerate persons, while not exercising faith, could obey God? Depones and answers, he taught that they cannot obey God but by abiding in Christ, any more than unbelievers who do not obey him at all.

That deponent attended at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, in July, 1830, by Mr. Campbell. That about that time, as deponent thinks, on the previous Sunday, deponent heard Mr. Campbell teach in regard to self-examination, and say, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." That deponent does not remember particularly, but he thinks the exhortation was addressed to believers: That deponent does not just now remember what Mr. Campbell thereby exhorted them to do. Being interrogated, whether deponent understood it as an exhortation to examine whether they were believers or not? Depones and answers, no, I think not: Depones, that in fencing the tables on the sacrament Sunday, Mr. Campbell taught, that they only who were discerning the Lord's body were worthy communicants. Being interrogated, what Mr. Campbell taught was the reason why,

when the blood of Christ was shed for all men, and a way A was opened up for all men to God, some men only had the Holy Spirit; enabling them to come to God? Depones and answers, he taught that the election of God only do come. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were guilty before God, and deserving of con- B demnation? Depones and answers, yes: that all men are, by nature, the children of wrath: Depones, that Mr. Campbell always condemned carelessness and security—that is, false security. Being interrogated in what way Mr. Campbell taught, that a believer could be personally a witness for C God's truth? Depones and answers, by living on the truth, without which he cannot be a witness for it—and that being a witness for the truth consisted in confessing Christ.

Interrogated for the libellers, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell teach, that it was essential to faith, or a necessary D characteristic of it, that a man should have an assurance of his own salvation? Depones and answers, yes: it is faith that produces that assurance; for a sinner, believing the gospel, feels conscious that he is in a state of salvation: Depones, that, at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, at E Row, in July last, Mr. Campbell taught, that it was necessary, to the worthy partaking of that ordinance, that a man should discern the Lord's body as broken for himself.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that the enjoyment of God consisted in conformity to F the character of God, and being holy as God is holy: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught eternal life, as obtained in the act of faith, consisted in this, that the Spirit of God is eternal life, and that he that believeth hath the Spirit abiding in him. That a man lives on the truth, so as to be G a witness for God, by having the word of Christ abiding in him, which word was the love of God, which he came to manifest and to declare to sinners.—And Mr. Campbell taught, a change of mind was a proof of God's love to us,

**A** by showing that we love him because he first loved us : Depones, that Mr. Campbell never taught, that we could retain the assurance of God's love to us while we had no love to him. And that our love to God consists in this, that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the **B** Holy Ghost, and that the love of God, so shed abroad in our hearts, was manifested in us, to our fellow-men, by our loving them,—that is, desiring their salvation.

Being interrogated, how Mr. Campbell taught believers expressed their desire for the salvation of their fellow creatures? Depones and answers, by praying to God for them, that they may be saved. And also by doing them good in every way, as they had opportunity. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that a believer, in addressing an unbeliever, was entitled to say ~~that~~ the unbeliever was in : **D** a state of favour with God? Depones and answers, he taught that he must say to him, that he was in a state of rebellion against God. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught, that a believer, in urging an unbeliever to return to God, could add any thing to the word of God as his reason **E** for returning? Depones and answers, no.

Interrogated by Dr. Fleming, whether Mr. Campbell taught that there would be any harm in unbelievers praying for an interest in Christ, seeing he taught that all men had an interest in Christ already? Depones and answers, that he **F** does not recollect Mr. Campbell saying any thing about it. Being interrogated whether he has heard Mr. Campbell teach unbelievers to pray for a greater interest in Christ than that interest which, according to his teaching, all men have in Christ already? Depones and answers, that he cannot an- **G** swer that question, because he does not understand it. Being interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell teach unbelievers to pray for any other interest in Christ than that interest which, according to his teaching, all men have in Christ already? Depones and answers, not, as far as he

understands it. Interrogated, how far deponent understands A the question, and how far he does not understand it? Depones, that he does not understand what is meant by any other interest than that which God hath already given. Being interrogated whether, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, there be any other interest in Christ than that interest B which God hath already given to all men? Depones and answers, that he does not remember. Being interrogated what is that sin in themselves, for which they who know God mourn? Depones and answers, because that in them, that is in their flesh, there dwelleth no good thing—and that C they should mourn for every transgression of the law of God: Depones, that the deponent cannot name any particular transgressions of the law of God, for which Mr. Campbell taught that believers should mourn, in themselves. Being D interrogated what sin in the world, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, believers should mourn for? Depones and answers, the sin of unbelief, and all sins which are the fruit of unbelief: but does not recollect any particular transgressions of the law of God for which believers should mourn. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to E teach that unbelievers could of themselves believe on the Lord Jesus Christ? Depones and answers, no—for no man can say that Jesus Christ is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. Interrogated whether he ever recollects to have heard Mr. Campbell teach unbelievers to pray for the Holy Ghost? F Depones and answers, that he does not recollect.

Interrogated by Mr. Jaffray: Whether Mr. Campbell, at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper in July, 1830, taught that the sin of unbelief was the only sin which should prevent believers coming forward to the table of the Lord? Depones G and answers, he does not remember: Depones, that the deponent does not remember that Mr. Campbell read any passages of Scripture, as is usually done on such occasions: Depones, that the deponent is a joined member of Mr.

- A Campbell's congregation—and was a member of the church of Row before Mr. Campbell came to be minister of that parish—that the deponent afterwards ceased to be a member of the Church of Scotland—but when he so ceased he does not recollect—that the deponent again joined the Church of
- B Scotland in July last: Depones, that he is well acquainted with the mode of administering the ordinance of the Lord's Supper in the Church of Scotland—that he knows it is usual with ministers, in fencing the tables, to read certain passages of Scripture.
- C Being interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot: Depones, that in referring in a former part of his deposition to John iii. 16, as containing a statement of the gospel, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, Mr. Campbell taught the gospel to be a message of pardon and love to every human being without
- D exception: Depones, that Mr. Campbell in teaching that Christ would punish those who, at his judgment, were found in their sins, included under that expression not only the sin of rejecting the gospel, as above stated, but all sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the witness which he that
- E believeth hath in himself was to be considered not as apart from the record, but as testifying to the record: Depones, that deponent does not remember that Mr. Campbell, while teaching, before the communion, that self-examination was a good thing for a believer, taught it was a bad thing for an
- F unbeliever: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach, while he declared the gospel to be the forgiveness of sins, that men were to sin with impunity: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the way in which the holiness of God was manifested in the forgiveness of sin, through the blood of Christ,
- G was, that without shedding of blood there can be no remission—and that the effect of believing in this forgiveness would be to make men turn from sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that by believing a sinner acquired this relation to Christ, that he became one with him, and received his Spirit,

and was enabled to serve God without fear, in righteousness A and holiness all the days of his life. That in consequence of this a believer could tell an unbeliever that it was light to himself to be brought to the knowledge of God. Interrogated what light, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, did the unbeliever require? Depones and answers, to know that God B loved him. Interrogated when, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, did man first begin to think that God did not love him? Depones and answers, when he first sinned, and transgressed against God, which, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, was a work of the devil, whose works Christ came to destroy. C

Re-interrogated for the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that unbelief arose from the enmity of the natural heart against God. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that an unbeliever was or was not in a condition to examine himself preparatory to the Lord's Supper? D Depones, that he does not remember: Depones, that it was believers whom Mr. Campbell invited to the Lord's Supper. Interrogated whether when Mr. Campbell taught that God loved unbelievers because he loved all men, deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that God rejoiced in unbelievers? E Depones and answers, no: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell urge unbelievers to seek to be one with Christ, or words to that effect; which they were to become by receiving the Spirit of Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach that a man could without the Spirit of F Christ seek to be one with him.

Re-interrogated by Dr. Fleming: Whether deponent sees any inconsistency between his deponing that he does not recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell teach unbelievers to pray for the Holy Ghost, and his deponing that he has heard Mr. G Campbell urge unbelievers to seek to become one with Christ, which they were to become by receiving the Spirit? Depones and answers, that he sees no inconsistency between these two parts of his deposition.



- A Re-interrogated for the defender: Whether Mr. Campbell taught that an unbeliever came to believe on Christ by an act of his own, or by the power of God? Depones and answers, by the power of God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell commanded unbelievers to believe on Christ, and taught that
- B that was not a command from man, but a command from God; and that an unbeliever, while he continued an unbeliever, could not obey any command from God: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell in his prayers make use of such expressions as these, "Give us thy Spirit, O
- C Lord," by which deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean a prayer that God would enlighten us by his Spirit, that we might know more and more of the things freely given to us by God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell's praying in these terms informed deponent that it was a prayer from a person
- D who had, and not from one who had not the Spirit.

Being interrogated by Dr. Fleming, whether deponent was informed by that prayer that a man who had not the Spirit should not ask it? Depones and answers, no. Being interrogated whether he ever heard Mr. Campbell teach

E that those who had not the Spirit should ask it? Depones and answers, he does not recollect.

Re-interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the gift of the Spirit was included in the gift of Christ. And all this is truth, as the

F deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed)

PETER M'CALLUM.

WILLIAM DOUGLASS, Mason in Helensburgh, aged about forty-eight years, married; being solemnly sworn, examined,

G and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent attended almost always at Row church, during the year libelled, and has heard Mr. Campbell preach on the subjects of universal atonement and assurance: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that all men, through their connexion

with Adam, became sharers with Adam in his guilt, and liable A to punishment : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that by the sacrifice of Christ, there was access for every man to God, and in no other way. That deponent has heard Mr. Campbell state, sometimes that it was access—sometimes that it was pardon—sometimes reconciliation—and some- B times forgiveness—by all which, Mr. Campbell meant the same thing, as deponent understood. That deponent thinks he has heard Mr. Campbell state that Christ purchased all men—by which deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean the same thing as access and pardon. Being interrogated C whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell state what was Christ's end or purpose in purchasing all men ? Depones, he does not recollect.

Being interrogated, whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the pardon of all men had delivered D them from Christ's judgment to come ? Depones and answers, I never did that ; but Mr. Campbell taught that Christ would judge all men, and that by their works.

Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that God loved all- men, and that that love was to be chiefly seen in Jesus E Christ : Depones, that Mr. Campbell most assuredly taught that God hated sin. Being interrogated where Mr. Campbell taught that God's holiness and hatred of sin were to be chiefly seen ? Depones and answers, in the cross of Christ. Being interrogated what end Mr. Campbell taught God had F in revealing his love in Christ ? Depones and answers, his own glory and the good of men—meaning all men. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men derived the good which God so intended for them ? Depones and answers, the very reverse ; and that those who did not G derive that good from it must go down to darkness. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers were resisting, or only not seeing God's love ? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers did not see God's

A love, although it was provided for them, and that every unbeliever was resisting the will of God—which will was the salvation of men: Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell teach that men were saved whether they believed or not, for he taught uniformly the very reverse.

B Depones, that he taught, that along with the belief of the forgiveness of sins, it was essentially necessary to know God's character, in order to be saved; and that the knowing of God's character, in reference to the former question, was to know the Lord God merciful and gracious. Being interro-

C gated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that a man was a believer who did not know this? Depones and answers, that he did not teach otherwise than that there was no believer but what knows that. Being interrogated what Mr Campbell taught was the ground of a believer's confidence towards

D God? Depones and answers, the mercy of God through Jesus Christ. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that a regenerate person might, or might not, at times, be tempted to lose sight of that? Depones and answers, I often heard him inculcate, that, in departing from

E the way of holiness, a man lost the views of that which he formerly had. That the nearer a man lives to God, the stronger is his confidence, and that in departing from the Lord, he loses sight of that. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that a Christian man, as long as he was

F keeping the ground of confidence in his sight, was sure that he would be saved? Depones and answers, I am not so positive as to give a positive answer in regard to that—but Mr Campbell taught, that a Christian man, so long as he has that confidence, knows what he possesses.

G Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell called upon, or commanded unbelievers to repent? Depones and answers, yes—he said it was the command of God to unbelievers, to repent and give God glory: Depones, that he taught that a man cannot truly repent without glorifying God: Depones

that Mr. Campbell explained repentance, to mean a holy turn- A  
 ing from sin unto God. That Mr. Campbell taught that it  
 was God's greatest glory, in men, to turn them unto him—  
 because he had placed them in a condition to glorify him,  
 by removing every obstruction in the way of their coming  
 unto him. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught B  
 that that obstruction proceeded from God or from man? De-  
 pones and answers, he taught that the obstruction pro-  
 ceeded from man; but the removal of it from God: De-  
 pones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell teach that  
 an unbeliever could glorify God in an unbelieving state; C  
 because he taught that whatsoever was not of faith was sin.

Being interrogated whether deponent has ever heard Mr.  
 Campbell contrast a man's views of sin, before believing the  
 gospel, with his views after believing the gospel? Depones,  
 that he taught that he had very different views of it: that the D  
 difference stated, was, that an unbelieving man goes willingly  
 on to sin, while, with a believing man, sin becomes his burden,  
 and that it was such a burden, because it was so diametrically  
 opposite to the will of God, and so fatal to his own soul: De-  
 pones, that Mr. Campbell taught believers that it was their E  
 duty, daily and hourly, to pray for deliverance from sin.  
 Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that  
 it was sinful for a believer to be in doubt as to his state?  
 Depones, that he does not remember to have heard Mr.  
 Campbell say that it was sinful—but he remembers him to F  
 have said, that a believer had no ground for uncertainty.  
 Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, that God's  
 love to all men, in sending his Son to die for them, was pro-  
 duced by something in man, or by something in God?  
 Depones and answers, Mr. Campbell uniformly taught, that G  
 God loves men for no other reason, than that he loves them  
 —at least I never heard him adduce another reason.

That deponent never heard Mr. Campbell say, that God  
 had any joy in contemplating unbelievers; but he taught that

A God had joy in contemplating believers—and that the reason why God had joy in believers was, because they were most glorifying to him, and living in strictest conformity to his commands : And depones, that Mr. Campbell has also taught, on that subject, that believers were they who saw themselves most  
 B needy ; and that God was most glorified, in that they sought most at his hand : Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell express his disapprobation of sorrowing for sin : and that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell press the acceptance of the gospel on unbelievers. Being interrogated whether  
 C he taught, that they could accept it by themselves or not ? Depones and answers, he taught uniformly, that a man can do nothing of himself, but by the Spirit. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, how Christ had right to judge men ? Depones, that it was because the Father had com-  
 D mitted all judgment to him, and that was his right.

Depones, that, in spring last, deponent heard Mr. Campbell make an explanation from the pulpit, immediately after the conclusion of his sermon. Being interrogated, on what subject that explanation was made ? Depones and answers,  
 E that, in the end of February, or beginning of March, or, at any rate, sometime in spring 1830, Mr. Campbell, after concluding his sermon, looked round and said that he saw three classes before him—the first neutralists—the second opposers—the third eagerly embracing the pardon that he  
 F spoke of. That the first and second of these classes supposed that it had no reference whatever to judgment to come—but God forbid that he, or any other minister, should teach such a pardon—that the pardon which he taught was access to God—which, if not improved, would lead to condemna-  
 G tion, and a fearful judgment would ensue ; and, with respect to neutrality, he observed, that the word of God allowed no neutrality in religion—that they must be either off or on ; and that, in respect to danger, they who were neutral were in as great danger as those who were opposing. Being

interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught how the forgiveness of sin and Christian obedience were connected together? Depones, that he taught that Christian obedience flowed from a proper view of the forgiveness of sin. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that the forgiveness of sins was all that a Christian had to believe in regard to God? Depones and answers, he taught much more than that—that, for one thing, a man was to believe the grounds on which sin was forgiven—and, in a few words, that Christ was the end of the law for righteousness' sake.

Interrogated by Mr. Story : Depones, that Mr. Campbell C taught that there was life in Christ for every man—and that it was so in order that it might be infused into every member of Christ, by the agency of the Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and shewing them to every man—and that these things of Christ were the adaptation of Christ to the need D of man : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the members of Christ are to shew the life which they had, in their connexion with him, by conformity to the image of God in Christ. Being interrogated, who, Mr. Campbell taught, would be without fear of standing before him at his judgment? Depones and answers, they who have a solid and well-founded confidence in him as their God. All which is truth, as deponent shall answer to God. E

(Signed) WILLIAM DOUGLASS.

F

ARCHIBALD HAY, residing at Laggary, parish of Row, aged about twenty-eight years, unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel : Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell preach frequently within the time libelled, and in particular about the G atonement made by Christ, which Mr. Campbell stated to have been made for all men, believers or unbelievers. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean by Christ's atonement for all men? Depones and

- A answers, that the believers' and the unbelievers' sins were all pardoned in and through Christ, and that whoever believed and repented, admitted the love of God into his soul, and received the benefit of that pardon ; but that the unbeliever shuts out that pardon, and is liable to condemnation as long as
- B he continues to do so—and that he did not believe the record which God had given of his Son. And being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that the unbeliever would be condemned because he was unable, or because he was unwilling to come to God ? Depones and answers, the latter : Depones,
- C that Mr. Campbell taught that Christ had redeemed all men. And being interrogated, what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to state, in saying that Christ had redeemed all men ? Depones and answers, that every man had the same liberty of access to come to God, which they had not in any
- D other way but in and through Christ. Being interrogated, whether deponent recollects Mr. Campbell to have taught regarding the connexion between the forgiveness of a man's sins, and his Christian life ? Depones and answers, that he remembers Mr. Campbell to have repeated that, but cannot now explain it.

Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the work of God began in the soul of a believer when he believed in the truth of the gospel—and that Mr. Campbell said that the gospel was good news to all mankind : Depones, that Mr. Campbell

F taught that a man, before he believed, did not see the heinousness and hatefulness of sin ; but that he saw how aggravated it was after he believed. That Mr. Campbell taught that no man could give God glory aright except he that believed ; and that believers gave God glory by praising God, and

G having communion and fellowship with him : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that what was to give a believer confidence in God, was, that his sins were forgiven, and that he had received the Holy Spirit to witness that his sins were forgiven—that Mr. Campbell taught that a believer, by having

that confidence, walked in newness of life, and hated more A and more the sin which he had formerly loved : Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell say, that, through the weakness of the flesh, and the suggestions of the devil, a believer might, at times, lose the light of God's reconciled countenance, and walk in darkness until these clouds were B removed ; but that that was a wrong state : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a believer was sure of his salvation, if he kept the beginning of his confidence sure, and always persevered in the Christian life : Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that unbelief was the ground of condemnation, and that condemnation was the ground of judgment, and that all other sins, such as cursing, swearing, lying, and backbiting, sprang from unbelief. Being interrogated, what, Mr. Campbell taught, led a man not to believe God ? Depones and answers, that deponent does not recollect. Being inter- D rogated if Mr. Campbell explained why so many men were remaining in darkness, instead of coming to the light ? Depones and answers, because they loved darkness rather than light, their deeds being evil. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed)      ARCHIBALD HAY.





AT and within the Elephant Inn, Dumbarton, the 29th day of March, 1831 years, which day the Presbytery of Dumbarton met, pursuant to adjournment.

After prayer by Mr. Coltart, Moderator,

Sederunt—Messrs. M'Govan, Graham, Hamilton, Gregor, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, Carr, A. Sym, Lochore, and Fleming, Ministers; with Mr. Smith, Elder, from Luss, and Mr. Dunlop, from Cardross.

For the Libellers, compeared Mr. M'George, as their Agent.

For the Defender, compeared Mr. Carlyle, as his Counsel, and Mr. Caird, as his Agent.

Parties were fully heard and removed.

The Presbytery having considered the Libel, and the Answers of the defender to said Libel, the evidence adduced, and whole productions and proceedings, and being well and ripely advised, Find, that the first, second, fourth, sixth, ninth, and tenth counts, or charges of the Libel, are fully proven; and that the eighth count, or charge, is proven by one witness, whose deposition is corroborated by the evidence in support of other counts, or charges; and that the third and fifth counts, or charges, are not proven as laid. In respect whereof, Find, that the defender has entertained and promulgated the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ; and also the doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation.

From the above Finding Mr. Story dissented, in so far as the fourth, sixth, eighth, and ninth counts, are found proven, and in so far as the first, second, and tenth, are held to include the doctrines of the major; and protested for leave

to complain to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

Mr. Dunlop dissented *in toto*.

Parties being called in, the above Findings were intimated to them.

Whereupon Mr. M'George, as Agent for the Libellers, protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr against that part of the Findings by which the third and fifth counts or charges are found not proven as laid, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

Whereupon also Mr. Carlyle, as Counsel for the defender, protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr against the above Findings, except in so far as it finds the third and fifth counts, or charges, in the Libel, not proven as laid, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

The Presbytery appoint Messrs. Graham, Hamilton, Fleming, and Sym, to answer the above reasons of dissent, and complaint, and protest, and appeal, and defend the Finding of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

The Clerk was instructed to write to the Clerk of Synod, intimating to him, that as the case from Row will be before the Synod at its first meeting, it will be necessary to have the papers in his possession, relating to said case, brought up to said meeting.

Closed with prayer.

(Signed) JAMES COLTART, *Moderator*.

Extracted from the Record of the Presbytery of Dum-barton, on this and the preceding three hundred and seventy-five pages, by

WILLIAM JAFFRAY, *Presbytery Clerk*.

REASONS of PROTEST and APPEAL for the Rev. JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL, against the finding of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, on the 29th of March, 1831.

1. As to the first of the ten charges in the Libel—while the appellant has already in his answers admitted, in substance, the doctrine implied in this charge, and now adheres to that admission—he cannot admit that the *ipsissima verba* of this charge are fully established, or that although they were so, they give a statement of the doctrine taught by him in the sermon which it regards, sufficiently full to be accurate.

2. The first part of the second charge is not proved, and rests the character of a peace-maker on a ground different from that which appears in evidence. The second part the appellant does not object to, if the words “equal or according to” be understood to convey the measure, or expression of God's love to every man, as stated in the proof.

3. The fourth charge the appellant admits as proved in substance, with this indispensable qualification, that although the personal knowledge of God's mercy and forgiveness be essential to a Christian character and conversation, its *constancy* is not essential to regeneration.

4. The sixth charge is not only wholly unestablished, but totally disproved. The appellant did not debar, as charged in the Libel; and he did not rest unfitness to approach the table of the Lord on the ground set forth in the Libel. While the evidence on this subject contradicts the charge, and explicitly sets forth what the appellant truly taught, it completely harmonizes with the statement given by him, in reference to the sixth charge, at the end of his Answers.

5. The eighth charge is wholly unestablished and disproved.

While the appellant maintains that this charge remains entirely unproved, he refers to the obvious and grammatical meaning of the words, and in no degree desires either to overlook what is the true import of the evidence on the subject, or to depart from his own, in his Answers, which perfectly agrees with that evidence.

6. The first part of the ninth charge is totally disproved. The appellant has uniformly taught, that except a man be in Christ, as a member of his spiritual body, he neither has nor can have eternal life. The second part of this charge is admitted as established, only along with a similar explanation.

7. Although the appellant may have used such phrases, on the occasion libelled, as those occurring in the three last parts found relevant in the tenth charge—and even such as those in the two other parts found relevant—yet the whole charge is left in so mutilated a condition, as not to express his full meaning. And no witness for the prosecution has deposed in regard to it at all.

8. That that part of the finding which infers that the crime stated in the major is brought home to the appellant, is not a finding on the merits, but belongs to the previous and unexplained decision of the Presbytery on the relevancy of the Libel.

9. While the finding proceeds upon the Answers and productions, as well as on the Libel and Proof, the Presbytery have not employed these, except in so far as they conceived them to establish the Libel, and have neglected the important distinctions therein stated.

For these and other reasons, to be proponed at the bar of the Very Reverend Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, the appel-

lant trusts that the above finding of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, in so far as adverse to him, will be reversed.

(Signed) THOMAS CARLYLE,  
Counsel for the Appellant.

April 4th, 1831.

---

REASONS OF APPEAL for Messrs. GEORGE M'LELLAN, PETER TURNER, A. LENNOX, ALEXANDER M'DOUGALL, JOHN M'KINLAY, JOHN THOMSON, PARLANE M'FARLANE, and ALEXANDER M'LEOD, in the Libel at their instance before the Reverend Presbytery of Dumbarton, against the Rev. JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL, Minister of the Gospel at Row.

Against that part of the judgment pronounced by the Presbytery in the said case, on the 29th day of March last, which finds the *third* and *fifth* charges in the libel not proved, the libellers appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr,—for the following among other reasons to be offered at the discussion. It is doubtless true that in those special charges of the libel, the doctrines therein-mentioned are stated to have been taught in the month of October 1829, whereas it turns out that they were delivered in the month of September in that year. It is on account of this difference in the date, and not on account of any defect in the proof of the doctrines having been actually taught, that the Presbytery found the two articles in question not proved. But if the doctrines referred to involve one or other of the errors charged in the major proposition, as to which there is no dispute, then it is submitted that the Presbytery were entitled and bound to hold the two charges in question to

have been proved ; seeing that the doctrines therein mentioned were taught during the twelve months mentioned in the general minor propositions, that is to say the twelve months between the 7th September 1829 and the 7th September 1830, of which general minor propositions the Presbytery by one of their interlocutory judgments found the libellers entitled to that latitude of proof.

(Signed)     ANDREW M'GEORGE,  
Agent for the Libellers.

---

Proceedings in the case of the Rev. J. M'LEOD CAMPBELL,  
Minister of Row, in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, on  
the 13th and 14th April, 1831.

After some discussion as to the order of procedure, the Synod agreed to take up the case upon the appeals against the judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, finding the libel relevant. The minute of the last meeting of Synod, held at Irvine, referring to this case, was read, and the parties were called to the bar, when there compeared for himself the Rev. Mr. Story, as dissenter and complainer against that judgment of the Presbytery ; the Rev. J. M. Campbell, appellant against that sentence ; and Thomas Carlyle, Esq. advocate, as his counsel ; for the libellers Mr. George M'Lellan, one of their number, and A. M'George, Esq. writer in Glasgow, as their agent. The minutes of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, the libel, and Mr. Campbell's answers to the libel, having been read, the Rev. Mr. Story, of Roseneath, was heard in support of his dissent and complaint.

Mr. Story first read his reasons of dissent against the judgment of the Presbytery finding the libel relevant, in which, at great length, he showed that the terms in the major, susceptible of different meanings, could be taken in a sense neither contrary to the Scriptures nor the Standards.

He then proceeded to show that the appellant had, in his answers to the libel, affixed to these terms meanings corresponding to those which he had himself assumed, and that in absence of any definitions from the libellers, the court were bound, in equity, to admit those from the appellant. The only composition before them from which they could judge, were his answers to the libel. These affixed to the terms in the libel a sense in accordance with the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church—and as he was to be held innocent—as he was not a heretic merely because he was accused of heresy—he was entitled to have the rule laid down by the Assembly 1722, in regard to the Marrow of Modern Divinity, adopted in judging of the terms he used. That Act of Assembly says, “The passages from the said book are to be taken and understood (as in justice and equity they ought) in the sense and meaning of its author, gathered and appearing from the book itself.”

Mr. Story proceeded to argue that the Act of Assembly 1720, although, in the court below it had been regarded as finally and conclusively declaratory of the mind of the Church, had given no deliverance on this subject. He showed that it was not declaratory of the meaning of any of the Standards, for no question concerning their meaning had ever been before the house, but merely a decision regarding the doctrine assumed to be contained in a certain book; and accordingly all ministers of the Church were in future prohibited from recommending that book. That act, therefore, he contended, had no reference to the appellant's doctrine, unless he had been accused of promulgating the very doctrines of the marrow.

Mr. Story thus argued the fact of these being designated the Antinomian doctrines as decisive of their having no resemblance to the doctrines referred to in the appellant's answers; and that it was most obvious that the universal



pardon condemned by the Act of Assembly 1720 must have been pardon in the *first* of the senses which the appellant, in his answers, states the term may be used, and in which he expressly denies that he has ever held or taught it.

The mere declarations of that Act therefore in no way affected the reasonings, the object of which was to prove that the doctrines libelled, in a certain way explained, were not inconsistent with the Scriptures and the Standards.

Mr. Story then observed, that while the doctrines imputed to Mr. Campbell had never been condemned by any Assembly, they were countenanced by the previously existing Standards which the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms superseded. It was most true these last were now the Standards, and the only Standards of the Church—but it could not be unknown to any one minister of this Church that they were adopted by the General Assembly, and ratified by the law of the land, *because* they contained nothing contrary to the already received doctrine.

It was most competent, therefore, to hold that they contained no doctrine contradictory of what the previous Standards contained; and from these Mr. S. read various passages, which he argued, either expressly affirmed, or obviously implied that the influences of the work of Christ extended beyond the elect; and that if a man truly believed the gospel he could not be ignorant of the disposition of God toward himself—the two doctrines libelled.

But not only throughout these, but throughout all the Protestant Standards were these doctrines admitted; so that, in fact, did the Westminster Standards deny them, they would hold doctrine distinct from that of every other Protestant Church. He then quoted from the writers of our national Church—from Knox down to the present day, for the purpose of showing, that, in so far as the preaching of

the Church was illustrative of its principles, it established the position he had laid down.

That their language in preaching the gospel assumed these principles, or if it did not, and if it was to be explained differently, why not apply the same rule to the appellant and allow him the same freedom.

Mr. Story then proceeded to give his reasons for dissenting from the judgment of the Presbytery, finding the minor proposition of the libel relevant.

He went over the various charges, or counts, contained in the minor proposition of the libel; with respect to the first, he contended that, understanding forgiveness in the sense in which Mr. Campbell declared that he used it, there was in it no doctrine opposed to the Scriptures, or standards—that every time any Minister preached the Gospel, it was assumed that the barrier was removed, as to the hearers, and that, *therefore*, it was a right and proper thing to call on them to fear God and give him glory—and that, although every word of this charge was proved, it would not prove Mr. Campbell to have been guilty of preaching any doctrine condemned in 1720. He contended that it was undoubtedly the doctrine of Scripture, that had Christ not died for men, he could never have been their judge—God has committed all judgment into the hands of the Son of man, because he died in that humanity—because he ascended up on high in that humanity—because he is the Redeemer of the world—and Mr. S. said, that if this were heresy, he knew not the distinction between truth and error.

In the same way Mr. S. went over all the charges, showing that they ought all to have been held irrelevant, either because they consisted of detached sentences, the meaning of which could not be ascertained without the context; or because, understanding the terms agreeably to Mr. Campbell's own understanding of them, they contained nothing contrary to the Scriptures or Standards of the Church; and,

finally, he argued, that, as from no one charge in that minor proposition, by any just or necessary induction, could either of the doctrines of the major (assuming that they were the doctrines condemned by the Act of Assembly 1720,) be condemned, therefore the libel ought to have been dismissed.

Mr. Campbell then addressed the Court, in support of his appeal, as follows :—

Moderator,—I now appear at the bar of this very reverend Synod, as an appellant against a sentence of my Presbytery, finding relevant the major proposition of a libel against me. And I appear as an appellant against that sentence pronounced under certain circumstances; so that I have to engage your attention, not simply with a question of relevancy, as it came first to be discussed in the inferior court, but with a sentence of the Presbytery passed upon the relevancy, *having certain materials for judging before them*. It is because of this feature in the character of the pleading to which I now ask your attention, that I felt it needful that the answers to the libel should have been fully read; seeing that these answers are not to be regarded by this Court as reasons of protest and appeal, but as part of the materials for judging with which the Presbytery was furnished, when they came to that sentence.

And now, seeing that I may have to engage your attention for a considerable time, and that any impatience, on the part of those who hear me, might materially injure my cause, and affect the feelings with which they do listen, I would take this opportunity of entreating my brethren to bear with me in consideration of the circumstances in which I stand before them—desiring to state whatever I may be made to feel it needful to state, as briefly and concisely as will be consistent with being understood.

First of all, I would ask the indulgence of my brethren to myself, personally, feeling that it is not too much to expect

that what affects a brother will, even in that view, be acknowledged to have a claim on your attention. To myself, personally, I ask your indulgence, because it has come to pass that my teaching, as a minister of the Gospel of Christ, has been the subject of much discussion and comment, far and wide throughout the bounds of the church, and has been either directly mentioned, or very pointedly alluded to, in many books which have issued from the press, having the name and authority of ministers of the Church—because, except in as far as my answers to the libel against me are concerned, I have not had the ear and attention of the Church to my own statement of that which I teach—and because I come here under the conviction that many gross and serious misconceptions of that which I teach have been widely circulated, and received by many in the land. Now, assuming that my brethren have been desirous to avoid every thing like prejudging a case that was likely to come before them, still I cannot know how far they have been able to keep themselves uninfluenced by what they have heard and read. I therefore ask your indulgence, as one who has now an opportunity of stating in your hearing, by his own lips, that which he has been preaching in the district of the Church more particularly under your care. I ask your indulgence again, because coming here, not simply for the purpose of stating what I hold to be truth, but coming here as an accused and libelled person, I have not merely to deliver my character from misconception, but to deliver myself from the weight of a serious charge affecting my standing in the Church. But these, being personal considerations, are of comparatively little moment.

I ask the attention of my fathers and brethren, in the next place, for their own sakes, that they may not judge in the dark—that they may not rashly do a thing which through eternity they may regret—because it is possible that even with a conscientious desire to give righteous judgment, they may judge

precipitately, and so may judge unjustly ; and because ignorance, although that of a conscientious man, is not an innocent thing in the sight of God, when a closer attention to the matter would have given clearer knowledge, and placed him in a better condition to judge.

And I ask your attention, above all, for the sake of the truth of God. I am not here to contend about words—I am not here to contend about human dogmas ; I am here to speak about that which I have taught my people, not as *my opinion*—for with my opinion I should never have felt myself warranted to have come to them—but which I have taught them with absolute confidence, as the truth of God. Therefore I ask especial attention, because the truth of God is concerned, and because the truth of God is exposed to suffer loss through the attention being diverted away from the truth itself to words.

As truth must be expressed by words in passing from the mind of one man to that of another, there is always risk of men darkening counsel by the words they use ; and thus there is an awful responsibility on the part of those who use words, that they use them aright. But there is also an awful responsibility on the part of those who hear the words, that they take care how they hear, and not rashly conclude as to the meaning of the person who speaks ; for if they have mistaken him through rashness, they may become false witnesses of that man's teaching. And as this is a most solemn thing, I will ask your attention to two verses of the word of God, as to the responsibility that men incur in understanding or not understanding the word they hear. I would first ask your attention to what occurs in the 26th chapter of the gospel of Matthew. It is, as you will remember, descriptive of many of the circumstances connected with a scene of deepest interest, the appearance of our Lord before Pontius Pilate. I ask your attention especially to what is stated at the 59th verse : “ Now the chief priests and elders, and all

the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death ; but found none. Yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses." And what did these say? "This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days." Observe, this was the expression ascribed to our Lord by men whom the Holy Ghost has characterised as false witnesses. Now, look also at a statement that occurs in the gospel of John, ii. 19 : "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Now, observe a close correspondence—observe the almost identity between the words which the false witnesses ascribed to Christ, and those he used. Wherein was it true that these men were false witnesses? Because they mistook Christ's meaning. "He spake of the temple of his own body;" and not having taken pains to know that of which he spake, they gave a false representation of his meaning, therefore has the Holy Ghost spoken of them as false witnesses. I entreat of you, therefore, to take heed to the words which you may hear, and to remember that people may be able to quote my very words, and yet be false witnesses. And if men be false witnesses because they quote words in a different sense from that in which they were used, surely it is reasoning justly to add, that men may be accounted false judges if they judge not according to the meaning of the words used, but merely according to the sounds of words.

And now, Moderator, I am exceedingly anxious not to waste your time ; and, therefore, because a great deal to the point on which I would now speak has been detailed in the answers which have been read, I shall, as far as possible, avoid repeating what is there contained. I shall also seek to avoid restating any thing to the point, which I have heard now pressed upon your attention from the bar. I shall simply add one word to what has been already stated respecting the authority

of the Act of Assembly, 1720. I have argued, in my answers, that that Act is not of authority if the Barrier Act be respected. I have there stated, generally, that it was so far from being looked on as an authoritative thing, in respect of the doctrines of this Church, that the persons affected by it had no hesitation about remonstrating against what it contains, neither was there ever grounded upon it any charge of heresy against them. Since their time, not a few of the most noted of the Ministers of our Church have spoken with high respect of the Marrowmen, and of their conduct on that occasion. But what I refer to is, that men well acquainted with the laws of our Church, have taken liberties with that Act which they would never have dared to take, if they had recognised it as having the authority now sought to be given to it.

The first statement which I shall read to you, is from a note to the work of the late Dr. A. Thomson, on Universal Pardon, page 479. “In my own opinion, the language used in the Marrow of Modern Divinity is frequently unguarded, and the doctrinal statements sometimes *incorrect, unscriptural, and not accordant with the Standards of our Church. But I also think that the Act of the General Assembly is* LIABLE TO SIMILAR OBJECTIONS—that the alarm occasioned by the marrow doctrine was somewhat greater than was necessary—and that it led to declarations as unsound as any thing in the productions by which it was excited.”

*This is charging the declaration of Assembly with unsoundness.* I quote this, simply and exclusively, for the purpose of showing how a person well acquainted with the laws of our Church, felt himself entitled to write of this Act, which is now spoken of as if it were of equal authority with the Confession of Faith—in fact, as if it were entitled to supplant the Confession of Faith; so that when one reads this Act, he need not search farther to know what is the doctrine of the Church of Scotland. I hold, that if this had indeed

been the character of the Act, it was most remiss and unaccountable negligence, and a strange choosing of one, and passing by another, to ground upon it a charge against me, while another was permitted, without reprehension, to charge it with *being unsound*.

The only other quotation which I shall read on the subject, is from a pamphlet, entitled "Reply to the Lay Member of the Church of Scotland, by the author of the *Gareloch Heresy Tried*," (Dr. Burns of Paisley.) Thus he speaks of this Act of Assembly: "But the Assembly was rather rash in condemning the book for the sake of these expressions. Take the book as a whole, and particularly the notes appended to it by Mr. Boston, as explanatory, and it will speak any thing but your doctrine. I shall select a few passages, even without the help of the notes, and then you may tell us *who* are the *true Marrow men—you or we!*"

It is merely the liberty here taken with this Act of Assembly, to which I now direct your attention. Here this Minister of our Church assumes to himself the character of a *true Marrowman*. If any thing comes within the reach of that Act, certainly this does. I have said enough to show, that it cannot be good law in our Church, to hold that Act of Assembly as entitled to take the place of the Confession of Faith.

Now, Moderator, I come to the real subject, and I shall first state to you briefly what I conceive to be contained in the charge in this major proposition, and then seek to illustrate it as the truth of God; and afterwards I shall direct your attention to the history of the teaching of the Church on these subjects; not at all giving the Church's standards the place of the word of God—not at all referring to them as giving one single jot of additional authority to the doctrines I state; but, in the first place, out of thankfulness to God that he has preserved the light of truth in his Church from age to age, however partial it has been, and however dim its



burning; and, second, because I would seek, in as far as in me lies, to remove every obstacle to the reception of the truth itself which may exist in the minds of any.

The doctrines in question are thus stated in the libel: "That albeit the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, as also the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation, are contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and to the Confession of Faith, approved by the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, and ratified by law in the year 1690," &c. The doctrines, then, here stated, are "universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, and that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation." I understand the word atonement as having special reference to the work of Christ, viewed in itself, just as a thing done; and I understand that by the expression "pardon" is intended to be brought out those statements which I have been making to the people as to the circumstances in which the work of Christ has placed the human race. I understand the statement that assurance is of the essence of faith, to have reference to the feeling towards God on the part of the individual which I conceive essential to the exercise of true faith; and I understand the statement that assurance is necessary to salvation, to amount to this, that this faith, of the essence of which this assurance is, is necessary to salvation; and I understand the word salvation, as used by the libellers, and I don't wish to take any meaning but what, in fairness, seems to be their own, to denote not the present condition of man, as a state of heart and feeling, but a condition of man with reference to the judgment of God; and to express, of a man, the fact that he is not obnoxious to the wrath to come—that he shall not be a partaker of the second death, but inherit the promises of God in Christ.

Understanding the words, then, in this sense, I conceive that the first thing here, in respect of which I am charged with

heresy, is the manifestation which God has made of himself in Christ Jesus. The second is the condition in which men are, this manifestation being made. The third is the aspect of man's mind towards God, when he is in the condition of believing the truth of God; and the last is the principle of the future judgment; for I understand salvation to have that reference here.

Now, in my answers, I have presented to my brethren a considerable number of passages of the word of God, in which I conceive certain doctrines to be taught, with a short commentary on each, to illustrate the interpretation put upon them. What I have thus attempted to set forth as the doctrine of the Bible on the subject of the atonement is, that the work of God in Christ was a work for all mankind—that the feeling, the character, and mind expressed in that work, is the mind of God in reference to all mankind—and that whether we consider the words, or the prayers, or the pleadings with men, or the sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ, that they are all and every one of them expressive of the mind of God towards every human being. The doctrine I hold is, that the Son came to reveal the Father—that he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father—that he that knoweth the Son knoweth the Father that hath sent him—that no man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son revealeth him. That therefore it is in Christ that we see God—that in Christ we see God in our nature. It is not merely the seeing God in our flesh that is the seeing God, but it is the seeing the mind and actings of God in our flesh—it is not the mere fact that Christ is God as well as man that makes it true that in Christ we see God, but it is that going along the page of inspiration—reading the inspired history of our Lord Jesus Christ, when I see the expression of a feeling, I am warranted to say this is the feeling of God—when I see an action performed, indicating a motive, I am warranted to ascribe that motive to God—

that in every thing I am entitled to go from the Son to the Father, and so to form my conception of the Father by the Son—otherwise the incarnation is no revelation of God to me at all, and the actings of Christ do not discover to me the Father, and the seeing or hearing Christ may be without my hearing or seeing the Father.

Now, my dear fathers and brethren, I ask you to say, whether when Christ speaks of holiness, and pronounces the most unqualified condemnation of sin, you feel yourselves warranted to say, thus does he express the mind of God—that hatred to sin which he expresses the Father feels—to ask yourselves, whether when you hear Christ expressing approbation of goodness, or disapprobation of sin, you feel warranted to transfer your conception of the feeling of the Son to the Father, and to judge of the Father by the Son? I ask, then, if this is the case in regard to Christ's words, what entitles us to draw a line between the actions of Christ and his words? or what entitles us to say that the motives of Christ's actions are not motives that exist in the heart of God?—what entitles us to separate between his words and his actions? And surely if we are not entitled to separate between his words and his actions, still less are we entitled to make distinctions among his actions; and least of all, to separate from the rest that which is the greatest of them viz. the atonement.

Now, my dear fathers and brethren, whom I seek to address as in the feeling of the presence of our Father and our God, I ask you, whether you do not all believe that Christ fulfilled the righteous law of God?—whether you do not all believe that Christ came under that law, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy soul, heart, mind, and strength, and thy neighbour as thyself?* I ask you, then, *whether you do not believe that Christ did love his neighbour as himself?* And I ask you, whether you believe that *he himself has taught us to regard every human being as our*

*neighbours?* And do you not believe that the man Christ Jesus did love every human being, as a man—I say as a righteous man—as a man fulfilling the righteous law of God? If, then, the righteous man, Christ Jesus, did love every human being, and if the mind of Christ is the mind of God, surely it follows—alas! that any should wish any thing else to follow—it follows that God loveth every human being. I ask then, how did Christ express his love, and show that he loved every man as himself? Was it not by his deeds?—was it not by his dying, as well as by all his other doings?—was it not *in that*, above all his other doings, that he set forth his love? If, then, Christ loved all, and if thus it appears that God loved all—and if Christ's actings expressed his love, which is God's love, to all, then this great act of humbling himself to the death, even the death of the cross, this great act must be expressive of the love of Christ to all men, and, therefore, of the love of God to all men.

But, Moderator, while the mind of Christ is that from which we are to learn the mind of God, and while it is virtually denying that he fulfilled the righteous law of God, to say that Christ did not love every human being as his neighbour; we are further taught, that while Christ came under the law, he came under it with reference to another condition, the condition of reigning—he became a servant in the prospect of being a King; and he is exalted as a King with reference to what he did as a servant. The Father judgeth no man, but has committed all judgment to the Son. It is expressly said that his right to reign and judge, as a man—to judge, as the man Christ Jesus, is a right which he has *acquired as the man Christ Jesus*. Now, wherein is the righteousness of so exalting him? Take away the love to all men manifested in what he did, and then you take away the explanation of his being exalted. God says, Unto Jesus let every knee bow, and every tongue confess, because he has tasted death for every man. And this is not a mere purchasing of human

beings by an arbitrary price, but a purchasing men by love; and God saw it altogether consistent with his own glory, and altogether worthy of himself, that in the person of the Son he should be seen, and in the person of the Son he should be acknowledged, and that all should bow to the Son because of the character that was previously manifested in his work for man.

This, then, is the doctrine held—The love of God in Christ Jesus is proved to be a love to all men, because Christ came under the law which bound him to love all men, and because it was his love of that righteous law which was the reason of his being exalted as a King; and because it is to the glory of God that one of our kinsmen—our brother—one who has proved his love to us, should be the one to whom we are asked to bow the knee.

Moderator, Observe this, the bowing the knee to Christ is no outward ceremonial. The bowing the knee to Christ expresses the bowing of the will, the bowing of the heart, the homage of the affections. It is no mere acknowledgment of power, no mere acknowledgment of might—but is expressive of our will bending under, and giving place to, and receiving the authority of his will. Thus, then, it is, that the love manifested to every man, in Christ, is the foundation of that throne on which he sits, asking all men to bow the knee to him. And thus it is—they are asked to bow the knee to him, as to one who loved them,—who naturally cares for them, who bought them with his own blood. It is this knowledge which is to make it easy for them to bow to him, and, therefore, it is, that every knee is to bow to him, and every tongue confess. This, then, is the thing taught as to the character of God, as revealed by the work of Christ, that the work is a work whereby God is unveiled as loving all men; and that when the sinful children of men are invited to return back again to that God from whom they had gone astray, they are told to look at him in Jesus Christ.

The secret of God's character is revealed in the work of redemption. Christ came not to change his Father, but to declare his Father's name: and when we see the work of God in Christ, and the love of God in Christ, we are not seeing some love in God, some mercy and tenderness, which had come forth in consequence of the work of Christ, but we are seeing a work springing from what was in the heart of our *Creator* who has become our *Redeemer*, and, in becoming our Redeemer, has declared unto us what our *Creator* is. This, then, is the doctrine which I am charged with as a heresy, that I hold and teach that the love of God to his creature man is expressed in the work of the Redeemer—in the atonement; and that the measure of the love of God to every man, is to be found in the agonies of Jesus Christ. This is the aspect of God's character which I teach as the truth of God, and for teaching which I am charged with heresy.

I further teach, that this work of God in Christ being a work that has for its object the return of man to God, does bear upon its front, and reveal as its first aspect, the remission of the sins of the whole world;—that in Christ God came forth to man, testifying to him the forgiveness of his sins as a thing already given to him—as a thing that he is now invited to realize as true, and in the realizing of which as true, he is to be emboldened to come to God.

I believe that many have realized a good will in God to all men, who have not realized a forgiveness of the sins of all men. I do not teach the former—I teach the latter. I do not teach merely a good will, but a good will expressed in the remission of sin through the blood of Christ, and in thus giving to its objects a standing and a place which they would not have otherwise had—the place of persons whose sins are remitted.

Now, Moderator, there is a wide difference between these two, and I am anxious that the difference should be marked. Although I had understood that there was good will in God

to me, still it might have been a question whether my sins did not create an insuperable barrier to my enjoying any benefit from that good will. It might have been the reasoning of the heart, I know that God is good, and that those who continue upright in heart, may continue in the enjoyment of his goodness ; but I have forfeited his love, and, having forfeited his love, I can have no confidence towards him. It is in reference to this point that I teach, that the work of Christ Jesus testifies to us that sin has not blotted us out of the heart of God—has not dried up to us the fountain of God's love—has not made God to cease tenderly to care for us ; but that at the very time when he sees nothing in us but what he utterly abhors—that at that time his love was that very love which is expressed by the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and has come forth to us that we might know that God would have us return to him, God being grieved by our being away from him.

This is the doctrine which I am charged with as heresy, under the name of universal pardon—this is the doctrine which I hold to be taught in every page of the book of God where a sinner is called on to repent ; and according with this doctrine alone, do I see it a reasonable and intelligible command which God addresses to his sinful creatures, when he calls upon them to repent. There are two words which I see addressed by God to the sinner in the Bible—the one, “ Repent, and come to me and live ;” the other, “ Depart, thou accursed one.” Now, I conceive that when judgment takes its free course—whenever sin is perpetrated, the word “ Depart” comes forth ; but if grace interposes, and mercy and forgiveness be actually extended to the sinner, then the word “ Repent” comes forth. This, then, I say, that God every where invites sinners to repent—that God every where invites sinners to come back to him, whereby it is taught that God has forgiven sinners their departing from him, and so he invites them to return.

It has been asked, "If men's sins are forgiven, what occasion have they to repent?" But there is an awful ignorance of what repentance is implied in this, and an awful recklessness of the difference between good and evil; inasmuch as a person, so speaking, would teach that he has no motive to be sorry for his sins—that he has no cause to regret having offended his heavenly Father—that he has no inducement to repent of his having been polluted and debased, **excepting** the hope that he may be pardoned—that **take away the** desire of pardon, and you take away the only motive to repentance. But what is repentance? Is it not the heart turning to God, and putting trust in God, and glorifying God as God? Is it not coming from the condition of being as **gods** to ourselves, into the condition of having God reigning in our hearts? And can any man repent—can any man turn to God—can any man receive God to reign in his heart, so long as he does not know that God has forgiven him? Can any man rejoice in God *as God*, who does not see in that God his own friend, his own Redeemer, his own forgiving and loving Father?

Moderator, I have taught that this pardon is universal—I have taught that it extends to every human being; and, so teaching, I have also taught that it is *preached* to every human being under heaven, and that it is announced to men by the Lord their God in every act of his goodness towards them; and that therefore to ask how the pardon of sin can be thus extensive, while so many have never heard the gospel, or been told that Christ died for their sin—to ask this is to be ignorant of the meaning of **all** God's dealings with men—to be ignorant of the principle on which he *will* yet judge them, and on which he is *now* every where sparing them.

The Lord our God has never left himself without a witness. *It is testified by the Holy Ghost, that the Lord our God has never left himself without a witness.* A witness for God is one who tells the truth concerning God. What is



the Lord Jesus but a witness? That is, he did witness of the Father—he confessed the Father. Well, then, if God has never left himself without a witness, then the testimony which the Lord Jesus bare to the Father, is a testimony which has been always borne of the Father—it is fullest in Christ, but it must be, in substance, the same, every where, in all God's actings toward men, otherwise the witnesses for God must have borne contradictory testimony concerning God. Therefore I have taught that *everywhere* the forgiving love of God is preached unto men—that every where the goodness of God is leading men to repentance—that every where the rain from heaven, and the fruitful seasons, whereby God is filling the hearts of sinners with food and gladness, are so many preachings of the grace of God in Jesus Christ—are ~~so many~~ shadowings forth of that same name of God, of which ~~our~~ Lord says that he has declared it unto men, and will declare it.

This, then, is the doctrine concerning God's love to all, expressed by the work of God in Christ for all, and concerning the condition in which that work has placed all, which I have taught; and as to which, I have also taught that God hath never left himself without a witness, insomuch that it is proved to us to be the truth of God, not merely by the words of the Bible, but by every thing which God doeth;—so that to go about to prove that the forgiveness which is in Christ embraces all men—to go about to prove this from all the sources whence we have proof furnished us, would be to enumerate all the declarations of his own name—which is one name, for the Lord changeth not—that God has given from the creation of the world downwards. It would be to enumerate every act of kindness—every act of love—on the part of God, to rebellious sinners.

Moderator, This is a question surely of awful and deep importance; for it is no other question than this, what is the name and character of God—that God with whom we have all to do? It is not a question as to the meaning of this or

of that passage of the word, but the great question of what God would have us to believe concerning himself. And if the doctrine is true, then must it be found not in one passage only, but must pervade the whole revelation which God has given of himself.

The next doctrine charged as heresy, is the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith—that is, that the person who believes the testimony which God has given of his Son—the person who believes what God has taught of himself, is enjoying an assurance of God's love *towards him*; and of *such a love* in God towards him as produces in him a trust—a *confident and undoubting trust in God for all that is good, as what God is willing to give to him, and what he may, with confidence, trust God for*. Now I am enlightened concerning the name of my God in contemplating the work of the Lord Jesus Christ—the name of him from whom I have deeply revolted. Now I see that he indeed loves me, and tenderly cares for me—that even my miseries have been no proof of want of love in him—they have only declared his condemnation of my sin. Now I see the *justice* of the condemnation—now I see the *righteousness* of it—now, therefore, I shall no longer depart from the Lord my God; but henceforward put my perfect trust in God, and commit myself to him, and look to him for that which is good.

This assurance I teach to be of the essence of faith; that is, that no person can believe—that no person can really and truly believe that which God has revealed of himself, without being brought into this state of mind towards God, that he has a most undoubted trust in God for all that his soul desireth. There is not a *wish*, which he will allow his heart to cherish, with which he cannot, and does not, trust his God. This trust in God I hold to be inseparable from *the exercise* of true faith, and this is the doctrine with which I understand myself to be charged, in being charged with teaching that assurance is of the essence of faith.

Now faith, implying this assured trust in God, I have taught to be necessary to salvation—and this is the last part of what is charged as heresy against me. And as this is a part of the subject which I have not noticed at any length in my answers to the libel, I shall now dwell upon it a little more fully.

In saying that assurance is necessary, the thing taught is that the principle upon which God judges the world is this, that having revealed himself to men's hearts, and having invited their confidence to himself, in the Lord Jesus Christ, he will take account of men, according as they have or have not trusted their God; and that none who have refused to trust God, so revealed, can escape the wrath to come. Therefore to say that assurance of faith is necessary to salvation, is to say that, in order to be saved, we must trust in God,—it is to say that we must be righteous in order to be saved—it is to require that men should cease to trust in man—in the creature, and come to trust in the living God. And this is just to teach that when God has revealed himself as a loving Father to his rebellious children of mankind—and as a loving Father, notwithstanding of their rebellion—and as a loving Father to the extent that he freely forgiveth their sins; and when God has placed them under one who is their brother, as a king, and teaches them to see himself in this their brother—when God has thus come near to them, and the heart and feelings of God are now seen in the heart and feelings of the man Christ Jesus—when God has thus unveiled himself in such a revelation as is altogether fitted to inspire perfect trust and confidence, that God will not be content with any other thing than this, that he should be trusted, and that those who refuse to trust their God must look to partake in the wrath that is to come.

Now, Moderator, I have endeavoured to set forth to you the conception of the character of God in the work of Christ

—the conception of the condition of men as affected by the work of Christ—the conception of the feeling towards God produced by faith in Christ—and the conception of the principle of God's judgment of men, which I have sought to set forth in my teaching of these subjects as a minister of the Church.

I would here refer to the whole book of Psalms as containing the doctrine which I have now stated—that book in which is given to us the language of the child of God in all the various conditions in which he is placed—his language as a child of God—the language which he useth through the presence of the Spirit of Christ in him. The doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, pervades that book every where. I feel that I am speaking a word which will not be recognised as true, except by those who admit that to trust God for any thing, and to be certain of receiving that thing for which we trust, are the same thing. If any one hold that a man may be really trusting God for any thing, and yet uncertain whether the thing will be possessed by him, then I cannot press on that man even the word of God, I cannot urge it as authority in this matter, which he will feel, because such a person refuseth the meaning of the word, and no wonder that the word cannot come with power to his mind. But if I find men prepared to admit that to trust God for any thing, and to expect it, with certainty, from God, are one thing, then with such men can I come to the word of God, and show them, what indeed their memories may readily supply, an endless number of passages in which this is set forth as the condition of the Christian that he is one, trusting in God—having assurance of salvation.

Now, Moderator, I have said, in my answers to the libel, that I believe it is misconception as to the nature of repentance, and as to the nature of righteousness, and true holiness, that creates a difference of judgment in this matter. I

therefore entreat my fathers and brethren now sitting in judgment on my teaching, to bear in mind, with application to this subject, what we are uniformly taught in the word of God, that it is not the outward action that is good or bad, but the motive from which it springs ; and that the word of God recognises no motive as a right motive, but the glory of God—the word of God recognises no man as a righteous man but one who is living to the glory of God ; teaching that if the outward action or emotion is referrible to any thing else than delight in God, that action is not a good action, and that emotion is not expressive of a right state. Therefore, Moderator, seeing that unless men are doing that which they do in real sympathy with the feeling with which God commands it to be done—seeing that unless men obey the law, in their hearts, freely choosing it because they love it, even as God in giving the law enjoins it because he delights in it—seeing that otherwise obedience is a mere outward thing, of no account in the estimation of God—I ask how is it that any man can expect to serve God acceptably, or expect that God can have pleasure in him, so long as he is not conscious that he is obeying God purely, in the spirit in which God commands. And I ask how any man can be conscious that God's law is thus to him a delight—how it is possible for him thus to find it a delight, so long as he does not see himself at peace with God—so long as he has not personal confidence towards God.

I ask, and I entreat of my fathers and brethren, to believe that it is not for the sake of any thing lower than the glory of God and the salvation of men, that I insist upon these things ; for I do feel that the glory of God and the salvation of man are compromised in that moment in which the character of God is no longer recognised as revealed in Jesus Christ, and the true principle of God's judgment concealed from those whom he is about to judge ; yea, and the only light shut out which could prepare them for being found of

him in peace at his coming. If God has made himself known in Christ, then to be ignorant of the work of God in Christ, is to be in a condition in which we can give no glory to God ; and as all perish who do not repent to give glory to God, such ignorance must expose men to the wrath to come. Therefore, is it that I feel it to be no light matter, and that I would ask your indulgence while I direct your attention to what I believe is the real source of difficulty in receiving the truth of God, which I have now set forth. *It is the not realizing God's character as apart from God's power.* It is one thing to be the Almighty—it is another to be love. God is the Almighty—God is love. God has taken much pains to teach us to separate between the two, and has tenderly considered our condition in the way he has taken to do so, and has left us without excuse, if we do not know the difference—for God has come forth in Christ, as a servant, to show his character, as apart from his power. There is no glory in power, simply as power. Power belongeth to God alone ; but if we would praise the power, it is because of the character according to which that power acts. Therefore, as long as God is only seen as powerful, as long as he is only seen as the Almighty, God's character is unknown, and God is not glorified. But if all the actions of his creatures are to be *alike* referred to God, then God can have no moral character at all. If the condition of the wicked in eternal burnings, and the condition of the righteous in the kingdom of righteousness, are to be referred to God in the same way, then there is no character ascribed to God at all. If I am seeing the fact of one man being holy, and another man being unholy, as alike the fulfilment of the will of God, then it is quite clear that I dare not say, because of these things, that God is holy any more than that he is unholy, because if the one thing would prove him holy, the other would prove him unholy.

Now, I know and feel that the great difficulty to be contended

with in teaching men the truth as to the name of God, is that they will not recognise a will in God which the wicked oppose, disappoint, and frustrate—they will not realize that God may be grieved—that God may be vexed—that things may be taking place daily and hourly against the will of God. O this shows itself when men say, if God so loves all—if Christ died for all—if so much has been done to deliver all from misery, how should any be miserable? Is not God Almighty, and how should any thing happen against the will of God? But unless I can believe that things continually happen quite against the will of God, I can have no reason to believe that God is good or holy. I would, therefore, seek to bring men, when they oppose the doctrine that Christ died for all, to follow up their objections, and see what their whole difficulty resolves itself into, even into a principle which, if it were held consistently, would cause men to deny all moral character to God. I have never heard a word quoted from the book of God, which it was even pretended was a positive limitation of the death of Christ. I have no doubt heard texts quoted in which the death of Christ is spoken of, in reference to the election; but none which were alleged to state, that he did not die for all; and the difficulty expressed has been, not the authority of statements in the word of God, saying that Christ has not died for all, but this, that it was not easy to understand how God should love all, and some should perish. Now, I say, let it be distinctly known what this amounts to—let men know where they are going. It leads to this, that God has no moral character—that all events are alike pleasing to God; and that the charitable man and the barbarous murderer are alike according to God's will. It ends there, nowhere short of this.

The difficulty in believing that Christ died for any who ultimately perish, and that God has so expressed love to them, is a difficulty which remains, however small the ex-

pression of love is, that is supposed to have been made, in the case of those who are not saved. If men will reason as to the feeling of God from the ultimate result, and say that they cannot see how men should perish whom God loves, then they must hold, if they would be consistent, that there is *no love at all* in God to any but the elect, and that there is no feeling of interest in their well-being, expressed by God's care of the rest of the children of men. According to this view of God's character, we are not warranted to say to any that God bears them any good-will, unless we know that they are elected persons: and while this rests, ultimately, on the untrue and awful principle, that all events, good and bad, are alike the fulfilling of the will of God, it is at the same time so repugnant to those apprehensions of God which are written in the natural conscience, that it renders it impossible truly to stand in awe of God's coming judgment, or realize that there is indeed a wrath to come.\* I entreat the attention of my fathers and brethren to this, as a practical result of limiting the love of God; that taking away, as it does, the foundation of a righteous judgment, it prevents men from realizing that there will be a judgment at all; and connecting men's misconduct with the will of God, it cherishes the feeling that sin is something which men cannot help, and so is something which it would be unrighteous in God to punish. Indeed no man who does not feel that, in sinning, he is opposing and frustrating the will of God, can feel that sin makes him truly obnoxious to God's wrath.

Now, my reverend fathers and brethren, having endeavoured to state to you the doctrines called in question, referring as I have gone along to the word of God, but not so fully as in my answers to the libel—and having set before you what the principle is, from which arises all difficulty in receiving the plain meaning of the plain statements of the word of God on the subject of the atonement—I entreat your attention yet a little to what is the real feeling of objection to the doc-



trine of the assurance of faith, and the real cause of the difficulty men have in receiving it.

I believe that if we were to hold that Christ died for all, without holding, in connexion with this, that the person who understands the meaning of the work of Christ, has personal assurance towards God, then the doctrine of the universal atonement would not be objected to by the mass of mankind. I believe that many have held, and do hold, that Christ died for all, in whose case there is no objection taken to their so holding. I believe that it is when it takes a personal shape that it becomes a doctrine of offence to flesh and blood. The doctrine of the death of Christ may be contemplated by many as an abstract thing, (although, in truth, it cannot be far from any one of us,) but the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, comes to be a doctrine touching every man nearly; because it comes to every man in this shape, that it gives him two alternatives, either you have this assurance, or you are not a child of God—saying either this is your *habitual state*, or you are not a child of God;—and giving, as it does, no place for indecision—no place for living in a mist, not knowing whether you serve God or Baal—it is therefore a doctrine against which the heart of man rebels. But surely I do not need to say to my fathers and brethren, that its being so offensive is no reason for holding that it is not the truth of God. The things of God are foolishness to the natural man, for spiritual things are only spiritually discerned. Were it a thing that natural men could relish, there would be contained in that very fact an evidence that it was not the Gospel of the grace of God. But being a thing according to godliness, which leaves no room for indecision—which requires every man to know whose he is, and whom he serves—whether he is on the side of Christ or of the devil, therefore is it a thing the natural man cannot like.

Now, Moderator, having thus set forth concerning the doc-

trines for which I am called in question, speaking under the conviction that the truth of God is intended and fitted to *commend itself* to every man's conscience in the sight of God, and that *the having heard the truth*, places men under a responsibility to receive and acknowledge that truth, and that he who does not receive it, is left without excuse, just by having heard it, because of the manifestation of the true God that is in it ; I now proceed to ask your attention to another matter—not to the question, what is the truth of God? but to the question, what has the Church taught ?

Before entering upon this, in the way of reading extracts from any of the writings published by authority of the Church, I would ask your attention for a little to the nature of the inquiry itself. I feel that it is a very awful thing that it should be the feeling of a great many people, and a feeling from which I desire that my brethren may be saved, that the greatest charge against me is that, according to the conception of these bringing the charge, that which I teach is not consistent with the Standards of the Church. This is a great evil, that a toleration is ready to be extended if one would leave the Church, and out of the Church preach the same things—that it is held illiberal, and narrow-minded to blame a man for teaching and preaching whatever he believes to be true, while it is held a just ground of censure that he should teach a thing within the pale of the Church, if that thing is inconsistent with the Standards of the Church.

Now, Moderator, I am not admitting that the doctrines I teach are inconsistent with the Standards ; on the contrary, I maintain that they are not inconsistent with them ; but that, even assuming it were the fact that a person is not to teach within the Church any thing that is contradicted by the Church, I do not admit that I am chargeable with so offending. But I feel that to take this ground would be failing in duty to the truth of God, and more especially *at present*, when it is so general a feeling that it is charity to

be indulgent to all manner of opinions, and that to speak dogmatically is necessarily an evil thing.

Now, what I contemplate is to set before you some passages from Confessions of Faith, and other works of authority in the Protestant Churches, viewed in connexion with the doctrine held by the Church of Rome, to show that God, in his care of his Church, has yet saved the Church from any direct denial of the Lord who bought them—has caused many precious testimonies to have been borne to his truth; and that the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth, while, at all times, she has presented but a most limited and imperfect setting forth of the truth that is in her living Head, and of the truth that is in the word of God, that still she has borne testimony to the truth I am now setting before you, and never spoken against it.

Now, I undertake this task as a duty I owe the Church, not as a part of my defence from the charge of heresy; inasmuch as I hold that no man is entitled to call another a heretic except upon the ground that what he teaches is distinctly opposed to the word of God. I am not, in what I am now going to address to you, going about to show that that which I have taught is the truth of God; my object is to show that that truth of God, which I have taught, has hitherto, with more or less clearness, been confessed to by the visible Church.

And, first of all, I would read some passages, to show that the principle now stated as to the proper place of doctrinal declarations proceeding from the visible Church, has been recognised by the Church herself.

The first passage I read is from John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, Book III., where he engrosses the Old Confession of the Church of Scotland. I read from the 18th Section of that Confession, "Of the Notes by which the true Church may be discerned from the false," &c. And I am desirous that it should be marked that there

is here no recognition of liberty to leave the true Church, while there is the recognition of a true and a false Church.

“ Because that Satan from the beginning hath laboured to deck his pestilent synagogue with the title of the church of God, and hath inflamed the hearts of cruel murderers to persecute, trouble, and molest the true church and members thereof, as Cain did Abel, Ishmael Isaac, Esau, Jacob, and the whole priesthood of the Jews Jesus Christ himself, and his apostles after him ; it is a thing most requisite that the true church be discerned from the filthy synagogue, by clear and perfect notes, lest we, being deceived, receive and embrace, to our own condemnation, the one for the other. The notes, signs, and assured tokens, whereby the immaculate spouse of Christ Jesus is known from the horrible harlot the church malignant, we affirm, are neither antiquity, title ~~usurped~~, lineal descent, place appointed, nor multitude of men approving any error ; for Cain in age and title was preferred to Abel and Seth ; Jerusalem had prerogative above all places of the earth, where also were the priests lineally descended from Aaron ; and greater multitudes followed the scribes, pharisees, and priests, than unfeignedly believed, approved Christ Jesus and his doctrine ; and yet, as we suppose, no man of whole judgment will grant, that any of the forenamed were the church of God.”

“ When controversy then happeneth, for the right understanding of any place or sentence of scripture, or for the reformation of any abuse within the church of God, *we ought not so much to look what men before us have said and done, as unto that which the Holy Ghost uniformly speaketh within the body of the scriptures*, and unto that which Christ Jesus himself did, and commanded to be done. For this is a thing universally granted, That the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit of Unity, is in nothing contrary to himself. If then the interpretation, determination or sentence of any doctor, church or council, repugn to the plain word of God, written

in any other place of scripture, it is a thing most certain, that *there* is not the true understanding and meaning of the Holy Ghost ; *supposing that councils, realms, and nations have approved and received the same* : for we dare not receive and admit any interpretation, which directly oppugneth to any principal point of our faith, to any other plain text of scripture, or yet to the rule of charity.

“ And, as we believe and confess the scriptures of God sufficient to instruct and make the man of God perfect ; so do we affirm and avow the authority of the same to be of God, and neither to depend on men nor angels. We affirm therefore, that such as allege the scriptures to have no authority, but that which is received from the church, to be blasphemous against God, and injurious to the true church, which always heareth and obeyeth the voice of her own Spouse and Pastor, but taketh not upon her to be mistress over the same.”

In connexion with this I read a passage from the preface to the same Confession of the Church of Scotland—the Confession of 1560, which has always been recognised as of authority in the Church. I entreat your attention to what is here stated,—I read from Dunlop’s Collection of Confessions, vol. ii. p. 17—“ Protestand that gif onie man will note in this our confessioun onie Artickle or sentence repugnant to God’s halie word, that it wald pleis him of his gentleness and for christian charities sake to admonish us of the same in writing; and, we upon our honoures and fidelitie, be God’s grace, do promise unto him satisfacioun fra the mouth of God, that is, fra his haly scriptures, or else reformation of that quhilk he sal prove to be amisse.” Thus is there distinctly recognised a principle, which, meeting us here in the preface, must be applied to the whole Confession—that the Church would not have us to conceive that she puts her Confession on a level with the Scriptures, and that her language, to any of her children, would never be, I

charge you with heresy, because you do not hold that which I have taught you ; but that she distinctly says, to all her children, I shall not charge you with heresy, excepting upon the ground, that you hold what is not according to the word of God ; and if you show me that any thing that I have taught you is inconsistent with the word of God, I shall give it up, and allow you to regard it as heresy.

I would now ask your attention to another Confession of Faith—the later Confession of Helvetia. The recognition of this Confession, by the Church of Scotland, is thus recorded in Calderwood's History :—" 1566. The Confession, called commonly the later Confession of Helvetia, was approved by this Assemblie, but with exception against some holydayes, the very same which K. James urged thereafter : And they ordained the interpretation or translation, made by Mr. Robt. Pont, to be printed, together with the Epistles, sent by the Assemblie, approving the same ; providing a note be put in the margine of the said Confession when mention is made of some holy-dayes." This Confession, therefore, is of authority ; and I find the following statement in its preface, which I feel to be the more precious, because this Confession was received by a great many churches on the Continent, having been intended for the purpose of bringing together a number of Churches. I read from the original Latin, "*Ante omnia vero protestamur, nos semper esse paratissimos, omnia et singula hic a nobis proposita, si quis requirat, copiosius explicare, denique meliora ex verbo Dei descendentibus, non sine gratia actione et cedere et obsequi in Domino, cui laus et gloria.*"—"Above all, we solemnly declare that we are always most ready, as to all and every thing here laid down by us, if any should require it of us, more fully to explain ; and, in fine, to any teaching us better things from the word of God, with the expression of our thanks, both to yield and bow in the Lord, to whom be the praise and glory."

Now what I see thus put forth in this most important truth, that the place of the Church, in respect of professing Christians, is the place of the father of a family in respect of his children; whose place is to teach them, out of the word of God, that which he believes to be contained in the word of God; and to ask their faith to that *because* it is in the word of God; but who is going out of his place, and forgetting what it truly is, the moment he says that any thing is to be received *because* he says it, and that he is not obliged to give any higher authority for what he teaches than his own. When the Church says to both ministers and people, This is my Confession of Faith: if any thing in it appear to you inconsistent with the word of God, I am prepared to go with you to the word of God to settle the matter—then does the Church speak according to her place. But if, instead of this, she says, This I have fixed to be the meaning of the word of God, and you cannot take any other meaning without being excluded from my communion; and to entitle me so to exclude you, I do not need to prove to you, that what you hold and teach is contrary to the Scriptures; it is quite enough that it is contrary to my Confession of Faith. I say, if the Church of Christ use this language, she no longer remembers her place as the Church. Is the Church of Scotland not bound by the principle now set forth? Does she become entitled to hold any other language, because she is an established church, or by the toleration of dissenters, or the liberty which she may be willing to give to her members to join any denomination they please? Does she regard herself as the Church, and, if so, what constitutes her the Church? What is the inspired definition of the Church? Not that she is a body *formed by Act of Parliament*, but that she is “THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.” That is the definition given by the Holy Ghost; and that, alone, is the definition for a Christian to recognise. The Church requires not endow-

ment to make her a Church. She was a Church before she was endowed; and if her endowment was taken away to-morrow, she would still be the Church. It is an awful heresy that would invade the freedom of searching the word of God by the ministers of the Church; that would teach that because she is *an established Church*, her ministers are to enjoy less liberty when seeking to bring forward, for the edification of their people, from the word of God, "things new and old." On this subject, I entreat my brethren and fathers to remember this plain fact, that the Church at no time has contained all the light that is in her living head—that of the fulness that is in Jesus Christ there has been but a part at any time in his body, as a living thing. And unquestionably the Church is to take to herself admonition from the example of the Apostle. (Phil. iii. 13,) "This thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forward unto those things that are before." In respect of the Christians to whom he writes, the Apostle distinctly recognises that their knowledge is limited, and teaches that it ought to be progressive, expressing his trust that it would be so: (v. 15.) What is true of individual christians, is true of the Church as a body; and surely as the Church would admit that an individual christian was rejecting the express command of the Holy Ghost, if he said I shall be satisfied with the knowledge unto which I have attained, and shall not seek to be taught farther—she cannot consistently hold that such language would become herself. And if I were so to understand her declaration in giving a confession of her faith, and that, in asking me to sign it, she was asking a pledge from me, that, as a member of the Church, I should be regulated by such a principle, then would I conceive that she was declaring her own purpose to disobey the command of Christ, and requiring from me a pledge that I also should disobey it. For surely our Lord requireth, and teacheth us, by the Spirit, that we should go on from grace to grace, and from



knowledge to knowledge, (2 Peter iii. 18,) "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." (Ephes. iv. 13.) If a Confession of Faith were something to stint and stop the Church's growth in light and knowledge, and to say, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther," then a Confession of Faith would be the greatest curse that ever befel a Church. Therefore I distinctly hold that no minister treats the Confession of Faith aright, if he does not come with it, as a party, to the word of God, and consent to stand or fall by the word of God, and to acknowledge no other tribunal, in matters of heresy, than the word of God. In matters of doctrine, no lower authority can be recognised than that of God.

Having said this much, I shall now ask your attention to the evidence which I desire to place before you, that the Church has hitherto been saved from denying the Lord that bought her—by which I mean denying the truth that Christ has died for all.

The Reformation Church came out of the Papacy. It was a protestantism, a *protesting* or testifying against error. When, therefore, I find any important doctrines in the Papal Church not distinctly protested against by the Protestant Church, I am entitled to hold that the Protestant Church recognised them as true. It is not likely that the Reformers would come forth and protest against minor things, and that they should not protest against great errors. Every person must confess that the question as to the death of Christ is not a secondary question, but is of the first importance; and that if it is an error to say that Christ died for all, then is it the worst of heresies, as it lies at the root of the whole system of religion; and if it is a heresy to say that Christ died only for the elect, then is it the worst of all heresies. Therefore, if the Roman Catholic Church held that Christ died for all men, I cannot believe that, if the Reformers disagreed with

her in this, they would protest against her masses, penances, and a thousand other things, and not lift one voice against the doctrine of universal atonement. On the contrary, I must hold, if I find the Protestant Church jealous about other things, and zealously protesting against other things, and silent about this, that she must have held that the Romish Church was right in teaching that the atonement was made for all ; and that the language of the reformers on this subject must have been, "We have no need to seek a reformation as to this great foundation truth—it has never been denied, however much it has been clouded, and its true nature and living power lost sight of, amid the errors which have been connected with it."

I believe I need scarcely say to those who know any thing of the Roman Catholic Church, that she does hold the doctrine that Christ died for all men ; but I may read a few words from a work of authority in that Church, entitled "*Catechismus Romanus, ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini, &c.*" (*Catechism of the Council of Trent.*) "*Si aliquis quærat, quæ causa fuerit, cur Filius Dei acerbissimam passionem subierit ; hanc potissimum fuisse inveniet, præter hæreditariam labem primorum Parentum, vitia et peccata, quæ homines a mundi origine usque ad hanc diem admiserunt, ac deinceps usque ad consummationem sæculi admessuri sunt. Hoc enim in passione et morte Filius Dei Salvator noster spectavit ut omnium ætatum peccata redimeret ac deleret et pro eis Patre abunde cumulateque satisfaceret.*"—If any are inquiring what the reason was, why the Son of God underwent the most extreme suffering, he will find this weighty cause, besides the original sin of our first parents, the vices and sins which men, from the beginning of the world even to this day, have committed, and which, henceforward, even to the end of the age, they shall commit. For this, in his suffering, and death, the Son of God, our Saviour, con-

templated, that he should redeem and blot out the sins of all ages, and fully and cumulatively should satisfy the Father for them. And this is the title on the margin, "*Christus pro peccatis totius mundi satisfacit, et ideo passus est,*"—Christ hath made satisfaction for the sins of *the whole world*, and therefore, suffered.

Now I have read this to show that the Roman Catholic Church does hold that Christ died for all men, and indeed this is known and admitted to be the case.

Along with this doctrine of the universal atonement, the Church of Rome held that assurance is *not* of the essence of faith. I read the following extract from the decretals of the Council of Trent. "The manner of the preparation is first to believe, willingly, the Divine Revelations, and promises, and knowing one's self to be a sinner, to turn from the fear of God's justice to his mercy, to *hope for pardon from him*, and therefore to begin to love him and hate sin: and, finally, purposing to be baptized, to begin a new life, and keep the commandments of God."—(Decretals 6 and 7.) Then they say, referring to what they conceive the errors of the Reformers, "*That sin are not pardoned to him that vaunteth, and repositeth himself only IN THE CONFIDENCE AND CERTAINTY OF REMISSION.*"—(Decretal 9.) "If any man shall say that justifying faith is *nothing but confidence in the mercy of God*, who remitteth sins for Christ's sake, or that that confidence is it alone by which they are justified, let him be accursed."—(Canon 12.)

It is not necessary to say any thing more to prove that the doctrine that assurance is *not* of the essence of faith nor necessary to salvation was the Roman Catholic doctrine; and that the Church of Rome taught, that a person might have faith, and not have the assurance of which I have this night spoken. Now, conceiving that the Reformers stood in this relation to the doctrines of the Church of Rome, that they saw on these two questions that this was the state of things, "The Church

of Rome has not denied the death of Christ for all—she has not denied a good will in God to all. She did not find this necessary in seeking to accommodate herself to the natural state of man, and to keep men in bondage ; but she has, in seeking this object, found it necessary to veil the truth that he that believeth in this love of God in Christ, has personal confidence towards God.—She has found that she could not retain men in their indulgence of sin, and in their seeking of indulgence for sin, if she held the doctrine of assurance, she has therefore given up the one and retained the other. She has retained the doctrine that Christ died for all, because she did not find it standing in the way of her designs, but, in many ways, found that she could turn it to account—but the other she has given up. Therefore we shall especially direct the attention of our fellow-men—of our perishing brethren—to what she has not taught. We will protest against her errors, and chiefly direct attention to the truth on the subject of assurance which she has denied.”—Assuming, I say, that the Reformers held *that doctrine* on the subject of the extent of the atonement, and on the subject of assurance of faith, for which I am called in question, would not this have been the view of the duty to which God had called them, which it was natural for them to have taken? And if we find that the character of their testimony corresponds with the supposition that they did see their duty in this light—if we find various statements fitted to have caused their doctrine to have been misconceived, on any other supposition—if we find that occasional recognition of the death of Christ for all, in their confessions, which was likely to be felt enough, seeing that this truth was not denied ; and at the same time find the prominent subject, and that on which there are the most pointed and strongest statements, is that of assurance, then are we shut up into the conclusion, that, in point of fact, the reformers held that the Church of Rome was right on the subject of the extent of

the atonement, but that on the subject of the assurance of faith they were called to protest.

I shall now read a few passages which entirely harmonize with the supposition that the reformers did not see themselves called on to protest against the Church of Rome in respect of her holding that Christ died for all.

I shall first read from "the Confession of Faith used in the English Congregation at Geneva, received and approved by the Church of Scotland in the beginning of the Reformation." "Thus of his free mercie, without compulsion, he offered up himself as the onlie sacrifice to purge the sinnes of *all the world*, so that all other sacrifices for sinne are blasphemous, and derogate from the sufficiencie hereof."—*Dunlop's Confessions, vol. ii. p. 5.*

The next extract which I read, as recognising the universality of the atonement, is from the Catechism of the Reformed Church of the Palatinate, used by the Reformed Churches of Germany and the Netherlands, and also by the Church of Scotland.

Q. 37. What believest thou when thou sayst, He suffered?

A. That in the whole Time of his Life, which he continued here upon Earth, but especially in the End thereof, he sustained both in Body and Soul, the Wrath of God against the Sin of *all Mankind*, that by his suffering, as by the only Sacrifice of Reconciliation, he might both deliver our Souls from everlasting Condemnation, and might also purchase for us the Favour of God, Righteousness, and everlasting Life.—*Dunlop's Confess. v. ii. p. 297.*

The next passage is from that confession formerly quoted—the Scotch Confession of 1560, Article IX. "Bot zit we avow that he remained the only wel-bèloved and blessed Sonne of his Father, even in the midst of his anguish and torment, quhilk hee suffered in bodie and saule, to mak the

full satisfaction for the sinnes of *the people*.”—*Dunlop’s Confess. v. ii. p. 38.*

The following extract is from the book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, in the Communion Service, proper preface for Easter day. “But chiefly are we bound to praise thee for the glorious resurrection of thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord: for he is the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and *hath taken away the sin of the world.*

The next is from the English Confession of Bishop Jewel. “And therefore that our onely succour, and refuge is to flie to the mercie of our Father by Iesus Christ, and assuredly to perswade our mindes, that he is the Obtainer of forgiveness of our sinness: And that by his blood, all our spots of sin, be washed clean: That he hath pacified, and set at one, all things by the blood of his crosse: That he by the same one onely sacrifice, which he once offered upon the Crosse, hath brought to effect, and fulfilled all things, and that for that cause he said, when he gave up the Ghost, *It is finished*, as though he would signifie, that the price, and ransom was now fully paid for the sin of mankinde.”—*Harmony of Confessions, p. 98.*

The next is from the Confession of Augsburgh. “Also they teach, that the Word, that is, the Sonne of God, tooke unto him mans nature in the wombe of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that the two natures, the divine and the humane, inseparably joined together in the unitie of one person, are one Christ, true God and true man: who was borne of the Virgin Mary, did truely suffer, was crucified, dead, and buried, that he might reconcile his Father unto us, and might be a sacrifice, not onely for the Originall sinne, but also for all actual sinnes of men.”—*Harm. of Confess. p. 102.*

Next from the Confession of Saxony. “And although we doe not see as yet, in this our infirmitie, the causes of this wonderfull counsell, why *mankinde* was to be redeemed after

this sort, but we shall learn them hereafter in all eternitie ; yet these principles are now to be learned, in this sacrifice there are to be seene, justice in the wrath of God against sin, infinite mercie towards us, and love in his Son *towards mankind.*"—*Harm. of Confess.* pp. 103, 104.

The next is from the latter Confession of Helvetia—that same Confession which was acknowledged by the Church of Scotland. "For we teach and beleeve that this Iesus Christ, our Lord, is the onely and eternal Saviour of *mankind, yea and of the whole world.*"

I shall now read from the Articles of the Church of England from Article II. "Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very man—who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."

I have now gone over a great proportion of the Confessions, in which we might expect to find the doctrine of the Reformers ; and I think it abundantly manifest that while these expressions were natural, as coming from the lips of persons who had not been accustomed to hear the death of Christ for all called in question, and who did not mean to call it in question themselves, they would have been most unaccountable expressions coming from the mouths of persons, who, having been accustomed to hear that doctrine taught, but who did not hold it themselves, were setting forth their views on the subject. They would have been dishonest had they not distinctly testified against this doctrine, had they held it to be erroneous, instead of using language which seems its natural expression.

I am speaking of the Reformation Church as one body ; and I may refer, as to an historical fact, to the desire to preserve the character of the *Catholic* Church, which the various Churches, formed at that period, manifested ; and out of this desire of unity arose a mutual interchange of confessions, which has literally identified them with each other ;

for when one Church approves of the Confession of another, she no doubt makes that Confession her own.

Now, I am coming down to a later period—to a period in which, I confess with humiliation, that, in her symbols of Doctrine, the Church, in these realms, ceased to state broadly that Christ had died for all. She has been withheld, through the superintending mercy of God, from stating that Christ did not die for all; but certainly she has not, in her latter Confession, pointedly stated that he did die for all; and I do not wish to conceal from myself, that the fact of her silence on this subject is to be referred, very much, to another fact, more awful still, that many had come to teach the opposite of the truth—even that Christ did not die for all. I hesitate not to admit, that while in the Confessions down to the date of the Westminster Confession of Faith, I find distinct admissions of the universality of the Atonement, I am not able to set before my brethren any such recognition in it—it only states what he has done for the elect—it does not state what has been done for others.

I wish shortly to direct your attention to the state of matters at the time the Westminster Confession was drawn up.

For some time previous to the sittings of the Westminster Assembly, and the giving of that commission upon which they proceeded to draw up a new Confession of Faith, it is a well known historical fact that there had existed a strong desire to have the realms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, bound together by the religious bond of having a common confession, and one form of church government. In the way of the former of these two objects, it was not felt, in any quarter, that any difficulty existed. The universal feeling appears to have been, that they had already, in fact, one faith, and therefore might easily come to agree in expressing that one faith by one form of words. As to the latter—the subject of church government—real difficulties existed, and which were not, in point of fact, ever fully removed. But



it is with the first subject that I now seek to engage the attention of my brethren. And I refer to the freedom to sign the solemn league and covenant, which so fully recognises the old Scotch Confession, ~~felt~~ by those who had previously signed the 39 articles of the Church of England, as showing how entirely we are warranted to think of the churches as one, in point of doctrine; and to derive our conception of the body of truth, which the visible church then confessed, from the various Standards of the churches taken collectively; thus making the fuller statement of one Standard, on any particular doctrine, to supply any defect, or any want of explicitness, in the statement of the same truth in any other Standard; as, for example, using the broad and explicit statement of the universality of the atonement contained in the articles of the Church of England, to fix the meaning of the less pointed declaration of the same truth in the Scottish Confession of 1560.

While, then, it stood thus with the churches of these realms, as to matters of doctrine, the Westminster Assembly was convened under the authority of a commission entirely in accordance with such a state of things. That commission recognised the articles of the Church of England, as the basis of the Assemblies' deliberations. It intrusted to that body the freeing the doctrinal statements of these articles from any misapprehensions which had arisen concerning them, *and no more*;—no more being felt needful in that department, to the uniformity contemplated; while, as to church government, a deliberative power was given, such as the diversity of feeling among those who were to be brought to agree, demanded.

Now, the Assembly being thus constituted, every one must admit, that if the Westminster Divines had gone about to state a limited atonement, they would have been acting in the face of the commission given to them, inasmuch as they would have been flatly contradicting the doctrines of

the Church of England. My statement is, that *they have not done so*; that *they have*, is the charge brought against them by every person who holds that they have expressly limited the atonement. But still I bring this other charge against them, and I deem it not a light one, that they have been silent on a point where the Church of England had been most explicit. The only apology I find for this is, that the error to which the Church of England had been most exposed was Arminianism; and so it had come to be needful to deliver her from the charge of not holding the integrity of the truth of God on the subject of election.

Now, this is the result of our consideration of confessions, on the subject of the extent of atonement, that all of them appear to have distinctly recognised its universality, excepting that drawn up by the Westminster Assembly. It indeed does not state this truth, but neither does it expressly deny it. And here I feel it necessary to refer to what I have said, in my answers to the libel, as to the use of the word Redemption in the Westminster Confession of Faith. I there stated that the word Redemption has reference to the deliverance of man from his evil state, and not to the atonement. I now ask your attention to the following words in the 3d section of the 11th chapter of the Westminster Confession. "Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf." Now, you will remember, that where redemption is spoken of, it is not merely said, positively, that the elect are redeemed, but, negatively, that none else are; but here where the *death of Christ* is spoken of there is no negative. But if the negative, where redemption is spoken of, had referred to the death of Christ, it would naturally have been introduced here, which indeed was its fittest place; and that when they are speaking pointedly about the death of Christ for the elect, they do not say it was for the elect *alone*, is not without a meaning.

The real history of this choice of language seems to be that, inasmuch as there were many men in that Assembly who were opposed to the universality of the atonement (which, alas ! is matter of historical truth, not to be denied,)—and, inasmuch, on the other hand, as there were many who held that doctrine, that there was no farther liberty taken with the articles of the Church, which they were revising, neither was there any farther compromise resorted to for the purpose of securing that harmony, with special reference to which they were met, than their observing silence on the subject of the extent of the atonement. Even in this view they have been guilty of a great sin ; but one as nothing in comparison with that implied in the charge brought against them, of flatly contradicting the Standards which they professed to be setting forth anew.

I now proceed to ask your attention to the doctrine of the Church, on the subject of the Assurance of Faith, the other subject on which I am called in question ; being so made, as I conceive, to take a place with all the Reformers. This was the great ground of controversy on which they were opposed to the Church of Rome, that they held that no man could be really believing the testimony of God concerning Christ, who did not believe that his own sins were forgiven him, and who did not feel himself in a safe condition while trusting God with the eternal interests of his soul. I do not say that the Reformers stated that the sins of all men were forgiven, but that they, proceeding on the universality of the atonement, as what was admitted, addressed every man in this manner, We ask you to be assured that you have forgiveness of your own sins ; and if you do not believe this, you do not believe the Gospel.—I entreat your attention to the following quotations :—

From the Confession of Faith used by the English congregation at Geneva ; received and approved by the Church of Scotland in the beginning of the Reformation.

"Yet, notwithstanding *it is not sufficient* to believe that God is Omnipotent and merciful, that Christ hath made satisfaction, or that the ~~Holy~~ Holy Ghost hath this power and effect," (viz. "to guide us into all truth, persuading us most assuredly in our consciences that we are the children of God, &c.") "*Except we do apply the same benefits to ourselves.*"—*Dunlop's Confessions*, vol. ii. p. 25.

From the Scottish Confession of 1560 :

"Which regeneration is wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost, working in the hearts of the elect of God, *an assured faith in the promise of God*, revealed to us in his word, by which faith we apprehend Christ Jesus with the graces and benefits promised in him."—*Dunlop's Confess.* vol. ii. p. 24.

From the Palatine Catechism, used by the Protestant Churches in Germany, examined and approved, without alteration, by the Synod of Dort, and APPROVED BY THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, in 1590 :

"Q. What is true faith ?

"A. It is *not only* a knowledge by which I steadfastly assent to all things which God hath revealed in his word ; but also an *assured affiance* (confidence) kindled in my heart by the Holy Ghost, through the gospel, by which I *rest* upon God, *making sure account that forgiveness of sins*, everlasting righteousness, and life, is bestowed NOT ONLY upon others, but also upon ME, and that freely by the mercy of God, for the merit and desert of Christ alone."—*Dunlop's Confess.* vol. ii. p. 286.

From SUMMULLA CATECHISMI, a Catechism approved by the Church of Scotland, and taught in the grammar schools from the time of the Reformation :—

"Q. When do we by faith *receive and apply to ourselves* the body of Christ crucified ?

"A. While we are *persuaded* that the death and crucifixion of Christ do no less *belong to us, than if we ourselves*

*had been crucified for our own sins ; now this persuasion is that of true faith.\*—Dunlop's Confess. vol. ii. p. 381.*

From Davidson's Catechism, approved of by the Provincial Assembly of Lothian and Tweeddale, at Edinburgh, 7th Nov. 1599 :

"Q. *What is this faith* that is the only instrument of this strait conjunction between Christ crucified and us ?

"A. It is *the sure persuasion* of the heart, *that Christ*, by his death and resurrection, *hath taken away our sinnes*, and, cloathing us with his awin righteousness, has thoroughly restored us to the favour of God."

This is the language of Patrick Hamilton, the martyr :—

"*They that believe not that their sins are forgiven THEM*, and that they shall be saved for Christ's sake, *they believe not the Gospel.*"

From the Augsburg Confession, drawn up in the year 1530 :

"Now repentance, or *the conversion* of the ungodly, standeth properly of these two parts. The one is *contrition*, that is, a terrour struck into the conscience, through the acknowledgement of sinne, wherein we do both perceive God's displeasure, and are grieved that we have sinned, and do abhorre and eschew sinne, according as Joel preacheth, "Rent your hearts and not your garments, and turne unto the Lord your God," &c. The other part is FAITH, which is begotten in us by the Gospel, or by absolution, and *doth believe that the sinnes are undoubtedly forgiven* for Christ's sake, and doth comfort the conscience, freeing it from feares. OF WHICH FAITH spake Saint Paul, when he saith, 'Being justified by Faith, we have peace with God.' *Afterward* there must follow the good fruits of Repentance, that is, obedience unto God."—*Harmony of Confessions, p. 127.*

"Such, therefore, as teach nothing concerning this faith,

\* Q. 28. Quando fide percipimus, & vobis applicamus pus Christi crucifixi ?

R. Dum nobis persuademus Christi mortem & crucifixionem non minus ad nos pertinere, quam si ipsi nos pro peccatis nostris crucifixi essemus : Persuasio autem hæc est veræ fidei.—*Dunlop's Confess. vol. ii. p. 381.*

whereby we receive remission of sinnes, but *will have men's consciences stand in doubt whether they obtaine remission or no*, and do adde farther, *that this doubting is no sinne*, ARE JUSTLY CONDEMNED."

"Albeit, therefore, that contrition, in repentance, be necessary, yet *we must know* that remission of sins was given unto us, and that we are made just of unjust, that is, reconciled or acceptable, and the sons of God, freely, for Christ, and not for the worthinesse of our contrition, or of any other workes, which either goe before or follow after. But the same benefit must be *received* by FAITH, WHEREBY *we must beleve* that remission of sins and justification are given us for Christ's sake. *This knowledge* and judgment bringeth sure consolation into troubled minds, and how necessary it is for the Church, consciences that have had experience can easily judge."—*Harm. of Confess.* pp. 165-9.

So that want of experience was held to be the only explanation why any one should think there could be any right or acceptable intercourse with God, where there was no assurance of the forgiveness of our sins possessed. As if it were said that assurance of faith was a thing that people could not live without excepting in being ignorant of their dependance upon God, and of the importance of his favour.

From the same Confession :—

"Another thing which we teach men, is, that in this place the name of *Faith* doth not only signifie a bare knowledge of the history, which may be in the wicked and is in the devill, but it signifieth a faith which beleeveth, *not only the historie, but the effect of the historie*; to wit, the article of remissione of sinnes, namely that by Christ we have grace, righteousness, and remissione of sinnes."—*Harm. of Confes.* p. 178.

Connect this with what I have stated concerning the difference between the work of Christ, viz. the atonement, and the effect of that work upon our condition, viz. the remission of sins. It is here taught not only that a man was to believe

the history, that Christ died for all but the effect *that* history had upon his condition, and that he had, through it, the remission of sins.

“Now, *he that knoweth that the Father is merciful to HIM, through Christ, this man knoweth God truly*: he knoweth that God hath a care of him, he loveth God, and calleth upon him: in a word, HE is not without God in the world, as the Gentiles are.”—*Harm. of Confess. p. 178.*

I feel thankful in the sight of God, when I find the knowledge of the remission of sins, in these confessions, thus inseparably connected with the knowledge of God, and not separated from the apprehension of God. For here it is not a pardon, merely as imparting peace, that they are contemplating, but that knowledge of the article of remission of sins, of which they say “He that knoweth it, this man knoweth God truly,” so recognising that this is eternal life to know God in Christ.

“As for the devils and the wicked, they can never believe this article of the remission of sinnes; and *therefore* they hate God as their enemy, they call not upon him, they looke for no good at his hands. After this manner doth Augustine admonish his reader touching the name of faith, and teacheth that this word *faith* is taken in Scriptures, *not* for such a knowledge as is in the wicked, but for a *trust* and *confidence*, which doth comfort and cheere up disquieted minds.”—*Harm. of Confess. p. 178.*

Here is recognised another principle which I have also urged that no person can truly serve God until he knows that God has forgiven his sins.

From the latter Confession of Helvetia:—

Christian Faith is not an opinion or humane perswasion, but a SURE TRUST and *an evident and steadfast assent* of the minde: to be briefe a *most sure* comprehension of the truth of God set forth in the Scriptures, and in the apostles creede, yea and of God himself the chiefe blessednesse, and *especially of God's promise*, and of Christ, who is the consummation of all

the promises.—*This faith doth pacifie the conscience, and doth open unto us free accesse unto God, that with confidence we may come unto him, and may obtaine at his hands whatsoever is profitable and necessarie.*—*Harm. of Confess.* pp. 146—7.

From the Confession of Saxonie, drawn up by Melancthon in 1551, that it might be presented to the council of Trent, and subscribed to by very many churches.”

“Now when the minde is terrified by this voyce that reproveth sinnes, then let it hear *the peculiar promise of the Gospel* touching the Sonne of God, and *let him be ASSURED that his sinnes are freely remitted* for the Sonne of God his sake, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is our atonement, and that of mercy, not for any contrition or love of ours. — But here we reprove our adversaries, who feigne that contrition doth deserve remission of sinnes, and that contrition must be sufficient. In either error there be great mysts. For remission is given *freely* for the mediators sake, and what contrition can be sufficient; yea, rather, the more the sorrow increaseth *without assurance of mercie, so much the more men's hearts doe flie from God*, and no creature is able to sustain the greatness of this sorrow, whereof *Esay* speaketh chap. xxxviii. ‘He brake all my bones like a lion.’ But these idle dreames of these writers do declare that they leade a carelesse life, and that they are unskilful in the gospel.”—*Harm. of Confess.* pp. 112—13.

Here the principle is recognised that repentance cannot precede knowledge of the remission of sins.

“Therefore it is necessary, that in the doctrine of *conversion* or *repentance* there should mention be made of faith. Neither is it sufficient that our adversaries say, that they also doe speake of faith, and that faith doth goe before repentance. For they speake of the doctrine of knowledge, “I believe the forgiveness of sins,” to wit, that they be forgiven *to others*, even as the devils doe know the Creed: but the *Gospel* doth require *THIS true faith*, which is *an assurance of the mercie of God*, promised for the Sonne of God his sake, and



resting in the Sonne of God, *which saith, I believe that remission of sinnes is given UNTO ME also, and that freely, not for any contrition, not for any my merits, but for the Sonne of God, who by the infinite goodnesse and wisdom of the Godhead is appointed Mediatour and Redeemer. I know that the commandment of God is immutable, so that every one, in their griefs, may determine that he is assuredly received into favour for Christ his sake. This is the proper voice of the Gospel: this Decree is brought by the Son out of the bosome of the eternal Father, and is sealed up by his blood and resurrection."*

I have stated that I hold and teach that Christ did not change God, or make him merciful, but that Christ came forth from the bosom of the Father of mercy to reveal him—I rejoice to find the same doctrine taught here, "*This decree is brought by the Son out of the bosom of the eternal Father and is sealed up by his blood and resurrection.*"

"Not to assent to this will and decree, is to contemne the Son of God: and concerning this sinne John saith (Cap. iii.) 'He that beleeveth not the Sonne, the wrath of God abideth on him.' But HE *that beleeveth that HIS sins be forgiven for this Mediatours sake, he doth certainly receive remission of his sins for Christ his sake, which is effectual in him, and quickeneth and sanctifieth him, by his Holy Spirit: and being now reconciled, he is undoubtedly accounted just for the Mediatours sake, and is heire of eternal life. Either to omit or to corrupt, or to dislike this necessary comfort, touching conversion, is as much as manifestly to extinguish the Gospel.*"—*Harm. of Confess. pp. 135, 6.*

"This common error of *doubting* is evidently refuted by these words 'Being justified by faith, we have peace with God,' also 'Therefore is righteousness of faith, that the promise might be sure.' For so long as mens hearts are tormented with doubting, they flie from God, they do not rest in God, nor call upon him; and the promise becometh unto them

*but a vaine sound, because they give not consent unto it. To conclude, it is the eternal and immutable commandment of God that we should believe in the Son of God, according to this saying 'The Spirit shall convince the world of sinne, because they believe not in me;' also (1 John v.) 'He that beleeveth not God, maketh him a liar.' Now it is a foolish cavil when they say, that we must doubt in respect of our unworthinesse, and not in respect of mercie. For the promise was therefore given, therefore the Son of God was appointed our Mediator, because we were unworthy; and that, for his sake, having suffered, being raised up againe, and now making intercession for us, and dwelling in us, and cloathing us with his righteousness, the Father might undoubtedly be merciful to this miserable lump of ours, being unworthy, and full of filthinesse: according to that saying, 'There is no condemnation to them which walke in Christ Jesus.' Also it is absurd which they say, that we must doubt by reason of our unworthinesse. For we are not to doubt whither our unworthinesse doe displease God, but, with true sighes, let us confesse that we are unworthy, and let us lay to the promise, whereunto God hath commanded us to assent."*

I would ask my fathers and brethren, whether they are not accustomed to hear the consciousness of personal unworthiness made an apology for the want of assurance? and I entreat of them to mark the manner in which the Reformers deal thus with such an excuse, concluding—"This error of doubting is altogether Heathenish, and doth abolish the Gospel, and, in true conversion, taketh away comfort from them that feelee the wrath of God."—*Harmony of Confessions*, pp. 185, 6.

From the Confession of Wirtemberg, presented to the Council of Trent, 24th January, 1552:—

"Seeing that we must *alwaies* acknowledge our sinnes, and believe that they be forgiven for Christ his sake, we think

it also meete that men should *alwaies repent*, in this life. For, *that we may truly repent*, we think that there is nothing more sure and certaine, than that of *necessity* we should have faith, to this end, that, *as the Gospel of Christ doth declare it*, so we may assuredly believe that our sinnes are freely pardoned and forgiven for our Lord Jesus Christ his sake."—*Harm. of Confess.* p. 141.

From the English Confession inserted in the General Apology, written in the year 1562, in the behalf of the English Church :—

"And therefore that our onely succour and refuge is to flie to the mercy of our Father by Jesus Christ, and *assuredly to persuade our minds that he is the obtainer of forgiveness for our sinnes*, and that *by his blood*, ALL OUR SPOTS OF SINNE be WASHED CLEANE. That *he hath pacified and set at one all things by the blood of his Crosse*. That he by the same one onely sacrifice which he once offered upon the Cross hath brought to effect, and fulfilled all things, and that for that cause he said, when he gave up the Ghost, *It is finished*, as though he would signifie, that *the price and ran-some was now fully paid FOR THE SINNE OF MANKINDE*."—*Harm. of Confess.* p. 98.

From the Book of Homilies of the Church of England :—

"It (that is Faith) is a belief, *not only* that the death of Christ is available for the remission of sins and reconciliation with God, but *also*, that he made a full and sufficient sacrifice FOR THEE, *a perfect cleansing for THY SINS*."—*Homily on the Sacrament, Part I.*

From the Catechism of the Reformed Church of Holland, entitled, "A Brief Compendium of Christian Religion."

Q. What is sincere Faith ?

A. It is a sure knowledge of God and his promises revealed to us in the Gospel, and a hearty confidence that all MY sins are forgiven me for Christ's sake.

From the Works of Becon, one of the English Reformers :

“ *He that doubteth* of the merciful good will and favourable grace of God towards HIM, and believeth not that God, for Christ's sake, is *loving* unto HIM, and forgiveth him *all* HIS *sins*, verily he is no true Christian ; but dying *in this his doubtfulness and unbelief*, he shall surely be condemned, according to this saying, He that doth not believe in the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. The erroneous doctrine of the papists, makes God false to his promise, quenches faith, blots out hope, destroys love, disquiets the conscience, fills the heart with whole seas of unquiet and wicked imaginations, and so drives the doubtful person unto desperation, and finally unto damnation.”

From Calvin:

“ Briefly, *there is none truly faithful* but he that being persuaded with a sound assuredness that God is HIS merciful and loving Father, doth promise himself all things upon trust of God's goodness : and none but *he that trusting upon the promises of God's good-will towards HIM, conceiveth an UNDOUBTED looking for of salvation* ; as the apostle sheweth in these words, ‘ If we keep sure to the end our confidence and glorying of hope.’ For hereby he meaneth that *none hopeth well* in the Lord, but *HE that with confidence glorieth that HE is an heir of the kingdom of heaven.* There is none, I say, *faithful*, but he that leaning upon the *assuredness of his own salvation*, doth confidently triumph over the devil and death, as we are taught by that notable concluding sentence of Paul, (Rom. viii: 38.) ‘ I am persuaded, saith he, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, wherewith he embraceth us in Christ Jesus.’ ”—*Calvin's Institutes*, 4to. p. 259.

“ Let this be the sum of all. So soon as *any drop of faith*, be it never so small is *poured into our hearts*, we by-

and-by begin to behold the face of God mild and pleasant, and loving toward us : yet the same we see from afar off, and far distant from us, *but with so sure sight that we know we are not deceived.* From thence forward how much we profit (as we ought continually to profit) as it were by proceeding further, we come unto so much the nearer, and therefore certainer beholding of him, and by very continuance he is made more familiar unto us. So we see that the mind, enlightened with the knowledge of God, is first holden wrapped in much ignorance, which by little and little is wiped away. Yet *the same mind is not so hindered* by being ignorant of some things, or by darkly seeing that which she seeth, *but that she enjoyeth a clear knowledge of God's will TOWARDS HER, WHICH IS THE FIRST AND PRINCIPAL POINT IN FAITH.*"—*Ibid.* p. 251.

Now, with these I would finish the reading of extracts for the purpose of illustrating this position, that the Reformers regarded as the great evil in the teaching of the Church of Rome, that the Church of Rome did not demand assurance, and did not regard assurance as of the essence of Faith, and necessary to Salvation.

I now would return to what I have already referred to in my answers, the statements on the subject of Faith in the Westminster Confession ; and I would recall your attention to a distinction which I have stated in my answers, and which I feel to be important, in reference to the libel—the distinction between the Assurance of Faith, and the Assurance of Salvation.

Moderator, I trust to be saved from any thing like making distinctions, where there is no difference. Our standards distinctly recognise a difference between the feeling with which a man contemplates that which God has revealed of himself, and which inspires confidence towards him, and the meditations of the Christian on his own condition, as one who has passed from death to life. But at the same time

that I hold that, strictly speaking, I am entitled to maintain that there is no mention of the Assurance of being in a state of Salvation in the libel, yet I feel it right to refer to it, that my teaching on these subjects may not be misunderstood.

Now, I hold that a person acting Faith in the Revelation of God in Christ, through the power of the Spirit taking of the things that are Christ's, and showing them to his soul, is in a situation, in which, if he put to himself the questions, Am I a converted person?—Am I an heir of glory? he will answer, I am. At the same time, I do not hold that it is inconsistent with the fact of a person being a regenerate person; that he should be without the assurance of his own Salvation at a given time, because I do not hold that it is inconsistent with his being a regenerate person, that the exercise of his Faith should be interrupted. On the contrary, I hold and teach that, through the temptation of Satan, and the darkening power of the flesh, a child of God may often be in doubt and darkness, of the most fearful, and the most appalling kind. And I believe it will be found in the writings of the Reformers, that while they so strenuously contended for the Assurance of Faith, as essential to Salvation, and that to believe the Gospel, was to believe the forgiveness of a man's own sins, they also recognised that, through the flesh, a child of God may be at times in darkness and in doubt. And I ask you to take the passages in which they make that admission, along with others in which they demand assurance, and you will find that, taken together, they contain what I demand as necessary to Faith, and what I recognise as the interruption of Faith.

As to the Westminster Confession, I have no hesitation in admitting that, while the principle, on this subject, there recognised, is substantially a true one, in as much as it would be great presumption in one who admits that a child of God may be in the dark at a given time, to define and limit what length of time that darkness may continue; yet, I see in

the statements of this Confession, on this subject also, the same indication of falling off from the living and pure teaching of the Reformation, that I see in its statements on the subject of the atonement. And while I hold that on the subjects of the Assurance of Faith, and the Assurance of being in a state of Salvation, they have not denied what those who went before them taught ; yet, I feel they have taught it in a form of speech exceedingly cold, and unfit to do justice to the truth.

Moderator, I am anxious to put you in possession of the exact feelings with which I contemplate the Westminster Confession of Faith. I hold that neither on the one subject nor the other, has it set forth any lie. As to the truth of the matter, its statements are substantially true ; but certainly, I do hold, that it is the fact, that from the living religion of the Reformation Church—from the indications of personal experience which we have in the Confessions of the early Church, there is an awful falling off in the Confession we now have.

Mr. Campbell was here interrupted by Dr. McLean, of the parish of Gorbals, who observed, Moderator, Mr. Campbell has repeatedly, and in the most indecorous manner, spoken of the very compilers of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and therefore you must not, Sir, hear any more on that subject.

Mr. Brewster protested against any interruption being given to the appellant in making his defence.

Principal Macfarlane—I perfectly agree in what has been said of the course Mr. Campbell is pursuing ; but I do think that the gentleman should be allowed to take his own way. The more correctly he speaks, the better for himself—the more incorrectly, the worse.

Dr. McLean—Nothing must be allowed to be said that stamps a stigma on the Standards of this Church.

(Hissing in the gallery.)

Dr. Dewar—I move that you stop the business until the gallery be cleared. I protest against your proceeding one step, while persons in the gallery have the audacity to express their feelings either in one way or in another.

A Member—We are met here upon a most solemn occasion ; and I presume that no one will venture to express any opinion, while we are endeavouring to form our own.—(Hear, hear, hear, from the Members.)

The Moderator—Perhaps it is better, if the thing is not repeated, that the gallery take this warning, and that we just go on.

Moderator, every word I say of this Confession of Faith is heard by my Judges. I do not deny that I have signed it—I speak as one who has signed it—but I lay it down as a principle, that the Church never took to herself the character of infallibility from the time she became a reformed Church, and that any member of the Church is entitled to express freely how far he believes that the Church has been growing in grace—advancing or retrograding in knowledge, I have expressed no personal disrespect—on the contrary, I have sought to deliver the Westminster Divines from the stigma which is fastened upon them by every one who says that they have limited the extent of the atonement. But I have freely declared my belief that, while stating the truth of God, they have not set forth the *whole* truth upon this subject, in that, on the most important point, they have been silent. I am stating a historical fact merely, and casting no blame upon them, beyond what you should be willing to recognise, if just ; it being our place rather to be willing to know the sins of our fathers, that we may be humbled before God for them, than to think of them in such a way, and hold their opinions in such esteem, as will expose ourselves to the danger of following them in that in which they may have erred.

Moderator, I am far from admitting, that while the Con-



fession is right as to the truth of the matter, it is also right as to the mode of expression, inasmuch as I believe that the manner in which a true principle is there recognised, has led to much practical perversion of truth ; and that the manner in which the liability of faith to interruption, and the consequent liability of a regenerate person to be, for a time, without the assurance of salvation, is there set forth, has fostered, in many, the delusion that a man may be a Christian who has never, at any one moment, had assurance of his personal interest in the love of God, or confidence towards God, as to his eternal well being. Here is the evil ; and this is the ground on which I stand, that while I conceive the spirit of our Standards is on my side, and especially the spirit of such a statement as the answer to the 36th question of the Shorter Catechism,\* still the language used, from a feeling of tenderness to the dark state in which children of God are sometimes found, has given rise to the practical feeling, in a great proportion of the members of our Church, that a man may be a Christian who has never had the Spirit of adoption at all.

While I am free to admit that the assurance of salvation, being connected with the present existence of the assurance of faith, the interruption of the latter must occasion the interruption of the former, I hold that the proper name of such a state is Unbelief, direct unbelief in the testimony of God concerning his Son—that the person who is in that state is, when in it, chargeable with making God a liar, and not to be comforted with any other comfort than this, that there is no excuse for his continuing in it.

I believe, indeed, that no person who once admits that to be uncertain of the forgiveness of his own sins, and that he has an interest in the heart of God, is to doubt his Bible—I

\* “ The benefits which in this life do accompany or flow from justification, adoption, and sanctification, are, assurance of God's love, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, increase of grace, and perseverance therein to the end.”

believe that no person who comes to that conclusion will feel comfort in that state.

Now, I have stated to this very Reverend Synod what are the doctrines which I teach, and in respect of which I am charged with heresy. I have shown to you the harmony that subsists between these doctrines and the teaching of the Reformation, and I have shown you that they have not, since the Reformation, been denied by any act of the Church. And now it comes to be my part to crave a judgment from my fathers and brethren—*this judgment*, that they would reverse the sentence of my Presbytery, finding the major proposition of the libel against me relevant—to crave that they would thus put to their seal that God is true—that they would thus give their testimony that it is no heresy to teach that God loves every human being—that Christ died for every human being—and that every human being has free forgiveness of all his sins through the blood of Christ—that it is no heresy to teach that he that believeth the testimony of God concerning his Son, has an assured trust in God—and that when God judgeth the world, and when his wrath is about to be poured forth, he will distinguish among men, according as they have had this assured trust in Jesus Christ or not—according as the love wherewith he loved them, while yet sinners, had induced them to come and receive him as their God, or as they have rejected that love and continued as gods to themselves.

I would again, for a moment, refer to the meaning of the word pardon : the meaning which I attach to it cannot be misunderstood ; and therefore there is no reason why there should, on this point, be any misconception, in this assembly, in judging of the matter.

In addition to what I formerly said, in urging on the minds of my brethren that they have to do with things, and not with words, in now proceeding to consider very briefly the judgment appealed from, on the subject of the minor

proposition of the libel, I entreat them to remember what manner of materials a few words are by which to judge a man's teaching. But I have objected to the finding on the major proposition, and if my objection be tenable, then is it of little importance to discuss the judgment on the minor. I would, however, state this general objection to it, that because the judgment of the Presbytery upon the major having been come to after hearing my answers and explanations, and containing in it no reference to these explanations, while the words are not explained in the libel itself, it is rendered quite impossible to know in what sense the Presbytery understood the major proposition, while finding it relevant, and whatever uncertainty attached itself to their meaning in coming to that judgment, that same uncertainty must attach to their judgment on the minor.

I also object, specially, with reference to some of the counts of the minor proposition, that one of them (the 10th) containing the fullest statement of any, and the fittest to give some apprehension of what my teaching truly was, was cut down, before being sent to proof, to a few fragments, incapable, by themselves, of giving any distinct conception of the doctrine taught in the discourse from which they profess to be taken.

And that another (the 8th) has been sent to proof, while rather containing a contradiction than expressing any doctrine: It is as follows.—You the said Mr. John M'Leod Campbell, at a parochial examination at Easterton, in the parish of Row, in the autumn of eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, when explaining the nature of faith from the question in the Shorter Catechism, "What is faith in Jesus Christ," observed, "That none could receive and rest upon Christ for ~~salvation, who had not an assurance of their own salvation;~~" or words to that effect.

Now, Moderator, I hold that this is absolute nonsense; for it is as much as saying that no one can rest upon Christ

for salvation, unless he has *previously* had the assurance of his own salvation ; therefore it ought not to have been sent to proof, because, being nonsense, it can prove nothing. Suppose I had been so absent, or that a temporary aberration of mind had been such, as that I used these words, they could not prove heresy in doctrine—they could only prove such absence or aberration of mind. But my great objection, on the subject of the minor, is, that the Presbytery have not explained their understanding of the major, and it is therefore impossible to enter into, or rightly estimate, their judgment on the minor.

I have this evening, Sir, directed your attention to extracts from works, some of which works are voluminous ; and I feel that, while I have been doing so, it may have occurred to my fathers and brethren, that these were *but extracts*. I wish I could have met that feeling by making them much fuller ; for I should have been happy, did your time permit, to have read largely from such works ; but I now refer to this for the purpose of pressing upon your attention that the extracts which I have given have furnished you with much ampler means of judging of the doctrines of the books from which they were taken, than were furnished to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, for enabling them to judge of my teaching, when they were put in possession of the several counts of the minor proposition of the libel. And I would ask, in this matter, to have given to me the benefit of the feeling which naturally arises on hearing extracts read ; and that it may be remembered that these counts are but extracts—very short extracts, even supposing them to be true—with which question, when speaking to the relevancy we have not to do. A brother, who addressed you from the bar, read a very considerable extract from the writings of the late Dr. A. Thomson. A member of the Court desired that he would also read such a note at the end of the book. Now I do not know what is in that note,—but whatever is in it, its being

called for as necessary to explain the extract read, teaches us how very cautious we ought to be in judging by partial quotations : and I ask to have the benefit of this in respect of these very limited statements furnished by my libellers.

I have fully set forth to my fathers and brethren the doctrines I have been teaching in the Church of Row, and wherever else God has permitted me to speak in his name : And, on the subject of my appeals, I now again ask that you would come to this conclusion, that the major proposition of the libel is not relevant, and consequently that there is no occasion to consider the minor at all. And I do feel that it is not inconsistent with the place which you and I now occupy, that I should call upon you, fathers and brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, who will soon judge us, that you sit in deliberation on this matter, as those who are not deciding on Confessions of Faith—as those who are not discharging a duty like that of lawyers seeking to apply acts of Parliament; but as those who are called to pronounce whether certain doctrines are true or false—are in the word of God, or not in the word of God—as those, in other words, who are called to the high responsibility of judging that word, of which the Lord has said, that that word shall judge you in the last day. And, therefore, O let me entreat and beseech you, in the name of God, that you be found realizing the awfulness of sitting in judgment not on Confessions of Faith, or acts of General Assemblies, but on the oracles of the living God. And O may God grant unto you all that in the Spirit of Him who is to come and reveal the righteous judgment of God—in the Spirit of Christ the judge, by the power of his Spirit, you may now judge righteous judgment, and give a decision which may go to settle the troubled waters of men's minds in this district of the Church, and more especially in the parish of Row; and give a judgment to strengthen the hands of a servant of Christ, that his heart faint not; because of the opposition of ungodly and ig-

norant men, that he may be strengthened to confess the truth, through your acknowledging the truth of what he preaches. I ask this as not forgetting that a decision of my Presbytery against me gives to the enemy of the souls of my people an advantage in resisting the truth of what I teach. I do not say that any are excusable who are thereby prevented from receiving the truth; but I say it is the duty of my brethren to remove a stumbling block out of the way. I have said the opposition of wicked and ignorant men; in so speaking, I do not refer to my judges. I desire that I may not be misconceived. I am not impeaching the honesty or integrity of my brethren—I only say they have given a decision which is fitted to have this evil operation—that it hath strengthened evil hands.

I now leave the cause in the hands of the Synod.

The Rev. Dr. Graham then appeared for the Presbytery of Dumbarton.

Moderator,—we labour under some disadvantage in appearing before you, inasmuch as the case now brought before this Reverend Court, by appeal from a sentence of our Presbytery, is one of a very difficult and delicate nature. It is a case of heresy; a kind of case which is generally regarded with suspicion, and is looked upon as discovering more zeal than prudence in those who bring it forward. But, Sir, had the charge against Mr. Campbell regarded matters purely speculative—had it been, like some heresies, a mere strife of words, or had it regarded a point of trifling importance, not affecting the welfare of the church, we should in such a case, have never ventured to make a charge. Had Mr. Campbell merely adopted the sentiments of modern Millenarians—had he ventured to determine the day, the year, or the century, when the millenium should commence, had he taught, week after week, in the church of Row, that in less than a score of years our Saviour was to appear on earth, to select for his resi-

dence the land of Palestine—to restore the temple of Solomon in its primitive splendour—had he merely taught that our blessed Saviour, thus enthroned in the temple, and surrounded by ten thousands of the saints would bear rule on the earth, we would have lamented that his time had been so unprofitably spent, but we would have declined any interference by the exercise of ecclesiastical authority.

It was with much delay and deep reluctance, that we took up the case at all. We did not forget the favourable impression that Mr. C. made upon us, at his first appearance among us. The fair talents that he displayed, and the good feeling that appeared in every part of his conduct, favourably impressed all classes, both rich and poor, clergy and laity. As a Presbytery, we did what we could to render his situation agreeable and comfortable. We gave him our best assistance to enlarge his church, and to build his manse; and the heritors being as willing as we were to meet his wishes, no situation can be conceived more favourable than that in which he was settled. He was warmly supported by his Presbytery, he was cordially esteemed by his people—he was liberally encouraged by his heritors, and no man had a fairer prospect before him of public usefulness. But this fair prospect was soon blasted by his adoption of some religious novelties, and his revival of some exploded errors. As he was then free from that reserve which he sometime afterwards assumed, he frankly avowed on all occasions the opinions he had imbibed. He introduced them as subjects of discussion in societies, and announced them from the pulpit to his hearers. They were industriously circulated through a great part of the kingdom. The heresy speedily became widely known: and I may here say, that I do not mean to prejudge the case, when I speak of this as heresy.

While Mr. Campbell was thus busily publishing his errors, we saw and pitied him. In his conversations with us, he maintained his principles zealously and perseveringly. In

his discourses from the pulpit, he introduced them regularly, in spite of every remonstrance. The Ministers who were accustomed to associate with him on sacramental occasions, intimated to him the uneasiness they felt from hearing his peculiar tenets propagated by him in their own parishes; and they proposed to him, that, if he would abstain from preaching them in their pulpits, they would refrain from taking any notice of them. But like all inventors of systems, he was not merely dogmatical, but dictatorial:—he declared he would preach whatever the Spirit dictated to him; and we were obliged, in self-defence, to give up all intercourse with him in the way of preaching; and in this we were either preceded or followed by every Clergyman in the Church, with the exception of one or two. While we thus shewed our disapprobation of Mr. Campbell's principles, we gave no decided answer to the complaints that we received respecting the tenor of his preaching.

At length, about two years and a half ago, a written complaint was laid upon the Presbytery's table; and, when presented, it was received with very different feelings from those of satisfaction. It contained charges both serious and specific; and it may be enough to shew the feelings of the Presbytery to say, that it was rejected on a mere matter of form—the omission of a date, which might have been supplied at the bar.

Notwithstanding this rejection, not very courteous to the parishioners, they returned with a fresh petition four months afterwards. We proceeded to examine it, and it was found correct in every external form. It was, in substance, the same as the former. When we examined the signatures, we found that there were several of them not in communion with the Church; but there were others to whom this was not applicable. Still the feeling was, forbearance to Mr. Campbell. We applied to these petitioners, and urged them to withdraw the petition; and it was only with great diffi-



culty that they were persuaded to withdraw it for a year, in the expectation that Mr. Campbell might review the subject, and be cautious, in his discourses, of giving further offence. All this took place in his presence; and if any thing could have made an impression on his mind, it must have been such a scene. He must have witnessed the difficulty in which the Presbytery was placed; he must have seen that our wish was, that he might be able so to compromise matters as to leave no stigma on his character; and so firm was our opinion that he would act in this way, that we resolved that no notice should be taken of the petition in our minutes.

The state in which matters now lay, was that a year of probation was granted to him; and when this period had expired, a new petition was presented from the parishioners of Row, referring to the former complaint, and stating that he was proceeding in the same course as formerly, with boldness, and enlarging the number of his offensive doctrines, which were productive of discord, and injurious to the minds of their youth—that class of society whose interests the Church has ever regarded with peculiar care and anxiety.

It must be borne in mind that the Presbytery of Dumbar-ton had in some measure identified themselves with the complaint of the parishioners. They were responsible for the advice which they had given, they were bound to have an eye on Mr. Campbell's proceedings, and certainly these had been any thing but satisfactory to them.

It is matter of notoriety the uneasy feelings that had been excited in the neighbourhood. Those who professed adherence to Mr. Campbell's opinions, seemed to intimate that they had received miraculous gifts from the Holy Ghost, for the purpose of confirming these opinions, and gaining proselytes. The rumours of signs and wonders which were spread abroad, were no doubt exaggerated;—but without entering minutely into the feelings of the time, because it is hardly possible to separate truth from falsehood, and though

it were, it would be improper to enter minutely into them, as it would force me to give names that I would not like to mention.—But the agitation was extreme—I will give you some idea of them, not in my own words, but in the words of the laity; and I would refer you for this purpose to the following passage from the Report printed last year by the Directors of the Glasgow Lunatic Asylum. “Another cause of lunacy, which, within the last year, appears to have been more actively in operation than formerly, and which has served to increase the number of our patients, is, the influence of erroneous impressions of religion. Mental derangement never can be produced by just views of the essential truths of the gospel, but intense and long protracted meditation on abstruse points of religious doctrine, or on prophetic mystery; remorse in highly sensitive minds on account of supposed unpardonable sins; and, above all, innovation in established religious belief, have been fruitful causes of insanity. In a recent publication, an eminent Physician, of great experience in the treatment of mental derangement, remarks, ‘Were I to allege one cause which I thought was operating, with more force than another, to increase the victims of insanity, I should pronounce, that it was the overweening zeal with which it is attempted to impress on youth the subtle distinctions of theology, and an unrelenting devotion to a dubious doctrine. This practice is an alarming error. It is growing to an excess fatal to the preservation of intellectual sanity, and in a manner, especially dangerous to the rising generation.’\* We would recommend to parents and guardians, to use their best efforts against the influence of new and questionable religious doctrines. The mental distress occasioned by the conflict between such doctrines, and earlier religious impressions, ends often in confirmed maniacal melancholy.” Such is the statement given by the Directors of the Asylum, published a little before the lodgment of the

\* Dr. Burrows.

last petition of the parishioners of Row ; and, by a strange coincidence, it was laid on the table on the same day with the complaint of the parishioners. Very blind would we have been, indeed, if we did not see the signs of the times, and see some of the effects of that which was going on among us. Error must be always injurious in the same proportion as truth is salutary, which is often compared to a draught of living water to a thirsty traveller. We saw a different river, whose waters were bitter, rush like a torrent through our land. We lingered not on the brink,—we searched for, and arrived at its source, determined either to heal this fountain, or to shut it up for ever.

It was, therefore, after this complaint was laid on our table, and after we had received admonitions from many quarters, that we found ourselves bound in duty to take up the complaint from the parishioners. In acting upon it, there were two courses that presented themselves to us. One was, to hold a conversation with Mr. Campbell ; and the other, to hold a visitation of the parish. After a good deal of discussion we preferred the former, and appointed a Committee to converse with Mr. Campbell, and to endeavour to take such steps as would put an end to the uneasy state in which the parish was. When this Committee met Mr. Campbell, he declined having conference with them ; and when the report of the Committee was laid before the Presbytery, knowing that we must proceed, we found it necessary to ascertain precisely the intention of the parishioners of Row, and they were asked if they were willing to convert their complaint into the form of a libel. This was a very simple proceeding ; but simple as it was, we were obliged to go to the General Assembly to vindicate ourselves for venturing upon it.

At Edinburgh Mr. Campbell got better information, and found that the Presbytery had done him no harm ; and a lawyer of the first eminence, who had been consulted, was unable to see any ground of complaint at all. The circum-

stance, though awkward to us, was productive of good, and was the foundation of the deliverance that enabled the Presbytery of Dumbarton to begin and carry on as they have done.

The first step which we then took was, to hold a visitation of the parish—to procure information respecting the precise nature of the complaint, and the precise nature of the doctrines which he was in the habit of teaching; and it may be necessary to mention another circumstance, that the complainers were in the lower walks of life, and not supported by the heritors. We held a visitation, and the result was, that we were satisfied that the parishioners had ample grounds to complain, and that competent witnesses could easily be produced, from the specimen we had that day.

A libel was accordingly presented, and, after all the preliminary steps had been gone through, the Presbytery sat in judgment, and found it relevant.

I have now to mention, and I will do it as shortly as possible, the reasons that influenced the minds of the Presbytery in finding the relevancy of the libel. The major proposition is short. It states that “the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, as also the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation, are contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and to the Confession of Faith, approved by the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, and ratified by law in the year 1690; and were, moreover, condemned by the 5th act of the General Assembly, held in the year 1720, as being directly opposed to the word of God, and to the Confession of Faith, and Catechisms of the Church of Scotland.”

We do not rest this case exclusively on the Standards of our Church. The first point to which the libel refers, is the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon; and complaints have been made here as if these terms were vague and inac-

curate. Any person who is acquainted with the English language, and acquainted with Church history, can be at no loss to understand what is the import of the language. In respect to the doctrine of universal atonement, there are, no doubt, expressions in Scripture that seem to give it countenance, viz. that Christ died for all—that he is the propitiation, not only for our sins, but for the sins of the whole world. These statements are very general, and it must be taken into consideration that the Scriptures are not a dry philosophical treatise. The great part of the statements of Scripture on religious doctrine are interwoven with history; and it must be borne in mind, that the persons to whom the first intimations of the gospel were dictated, and by them published to the world, were labouring under a strong national prejudice, reluctant to admit the Gentiles into the bosom of the Church; and strong language was necessary to show the wide extent of the evangelical administration—that it was a universal, and not a partial one. But there are statements which seem to limit it. Our Saviour says that he came into the world not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for *many*—“this is my blood shed for *many* for the remission of sins.” Our Saviour does not intimate that the benefit of the atonement was to be universal—it was to extend to *many*; and we have in Scripture some practical definition of the class to whom our Saviour alludes, when he speaks of the many: for example, the message to the husband of Mary, ‘thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.’—Our Saviour says, ‘I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep; all which point out to us the particular society for whom he gave his life, and which seem to give us reason to admit and assert the doctrine of particular redemption. At all events, supposing there might be some ambiguity as to what is the sense in which they were to be understood, our

Church has not left us at liberty—she has decided the question; and to us, who have subscribed her Standards, her authority is law.

I may now give you one or two passages, although that is hardly necessary, to show the sentiments of the Church on this question. In the chapter on the Divine Decrees, 6th section, we have the following passage, “Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation.” This is the affirmative state of the question; but the compilers of our Confession state the case negatively also, “Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.”

I have said, Sir, that this Church supports the doctrine of a particular redemption; and this passage seems quite sufficient to establish that. What is the meaning of this passage when it says, “Neither are any other redeemed by Christ,” &c.? The word “redemption” here refers to the work of Christ; and the meaning of the language is, that none are interested in the atonement but the elect only. And that this is the case will appear from considering in what sense the term was used at the time our Confession of Faith was drawn up. In the 31st article of the Church of England it is affirmed that “the offering of Christ once made is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole world, both Original and Actual; and there is none other Satisfaction for Sin, but that alone.” Now it is evident from this that the Church of England used the word redemption as synonymous with Propitiation. In her Catechism, too, where every word must be expected to be used in such a way as to be intelligible to the meanest capacity, it is asked, “What dost thou chiefly learn in these articles of thy belief?” and the child is made

to answer, I learn to believe—secondly, in God the Son, who hath *redeemed* me and all mankind.

This is the great difference between the Churches of England and Scotland, that the Church of England holds universal redemption, while our Church holds particular redemption.

I have already said that the Church, supposing the case was doubtful as respects the Scriptures, has expressed an opinion on the subject; but if it were a doubtful case, one about which good men might have differed, we would have been reluctant to press the law with unnecessary severity on any man. If by the terms universal redemption was to be understood that doctrine that was maintained about the period before our Confession was made, it would not have been productive of very great harm in the ministration of a minister of the Church of Scotland; for both systems agree in the same practical result, that we are warranted to preach the gospel, and to publish the offers of mercy to every creature under heaven.

Had Mr. Campbell merely been dissatisfied with our view, and expressed it in modest terms,—had he shown no intention of trampling our Standards under foot, we would have treated him with great lenity and indulgence. But he has proceeded much further, and to this doctrine of universal atonement he has added the doctrine of universal pardon, which is a doctrine not entertained in the Church of England. He has not merely speculated on the extent of Christ's death, but on the effect of it. He says that all sins of all men, collectively, without exception, or distinction, are pardoned: and that although this pardon is founded in the death of Christ, yet, *de facto*, it was pronounced so far back as the days of Adam. What is the language of Scripture in reference to this? There is nothing in Scripture that can be brought forward in support of such a view. We are told, on the contrary, that pardon is a future act of the Almighty

—that it is the consequence of faith. This sentiment is explicitly avowed both in the Old and New Testament. “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts : and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him ; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.” When the apostles were commissioned to preach the gospel they were commanded to preach repentance to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And what were the terms they used ? “ Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out.” The same view of the matter is given in our Standards, and I merely refer you to the article on justification, in our Confession of Faith. That there might be no mistake about the time when this pardon is given, our compilers mention still farther, that “ God did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect ; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification : nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth in due time actually apply Christ unto them.” The language of the Bible, as well as of our Standards, amount to this, that the effect of the death of Christ is not that unbelievers are in a *pardoned* state, but in a *pardonable* one—that pardon is suspended upon our performing the essential condition of faith ; and whenever a person truly believes, and comes, in the name of Christ, soliciting pardon, we are assured that pardon will be bestowed. This much, therefore, on the first branch ; and, at this late hour, as there are several of the Presbytery to plead in the same case, it was agreed that I should stop here, and that my friend, Dr. Hamilton, should take up the doctrine of assurance. We have come to another agreement that we are to say nothing on the point of the minor proposition, and if Mr. Story thinks that he has made any impression on the Synod on that subject, we leave him in full possession of his advantage.



Dr. Hamilton of Strathblane.

I have got, Moderator, a very easy share of the business—viz. to speak to that part of the libel which relates to “assurance.” It has been questioned, what is the meaning of assurance in the libel; and it has been affirmed, that it means the assurance of faith. It is evident from the libel itself, that this is not the case. We found the libel relevant, because the language it contained is the language of our own Church, and has become the theological language of Scotland. The act of the General Assembly, 1720, to which the libel refers, after quoting the following passages from the Marrow of Modern Divinity. “There is no more for him to do, but only to know and believe, that Jesus Christ hath done all for him.” “This, then, is perfect righteousness,—only to know and believe, That Jesus Christ is now gone to the Father, and sitteth at his right hand, not as a Judge, but as made to you of God, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; wherefore, as Paul and Silas said to the jailor, so say I unto you, ‘Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.’ That is, be verily persuaded in your heart that Jesus Christ is yours, and that you shall have life and salvation by him; that whatsoever Christ did for the redemption of mankind, he did it for you.” “For as much as the Holy scripture speaketh to all in general, none of us ought to distrust himself, but believe that it doth belong particularly to himself.” “This notion of *saving faith*,” the Act says, “appears contrary to scriptures, Isa. l. 10. Rom. viii. 16. 1<sup>st</sup> John v. 13. and to Confess. cap. 18, § 1, 3, 4. and to Larger Catechism, Quest. 81, 172. All which passages,” it goes on to say, “shew that assurance is not of the essence of faith.” This decides the thing; for assurance here can have no other meaning, than the assurance of salvation; but if any doubt remained on the subject, it is cleared up by the language at the top of the 2d

page of the pamphlet, from which I read, "The libel and answers." The language at the bottom of the first, and top of the second page, shews the meaning attached to the terms by the prosecutors; for they say that Mr. Campbell taught, "that no man is a Christian unless he is positively assured of his own salvation." This, I think, satisfactorily shews the meaning we are to attach to the term "assurance" in this Libel. This is the charge brought against Mr. Campbell; and all we had to do, was to see whether or not this doctrine which he was charged with teaching, was the doctrine of our own standards.

When we turn to the Confession of Faith, we find that in the definition of faith, it does not say that assurance is of the essence of faith; it says, (chap. xiv.) "the grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word: by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened." The Confession goes on to give a larger description of this faith, never insinuating that the assurance of salvation enters at all into its essence. "By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein; and acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are, accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace. This faith is different in degrees, weak or strong; may be often and many ways assailed and weakened, but gets the victory; growing up in many to the attainment of a full assurance through Christ, who is both the author and finisher of our faith."

The Confession instructs us, that the assurance of salvation

is obtained in quite another way. - In the 8th section of the third chapter, it says, "The doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men attending the will of God revealed in his word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God, and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation, to all that sincerely obey the Gospel." Our church, still farther, in the 16th chapter, second section, says, "These good works, done in obedience to God's commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith: and by them believers manifest their thankfulness, strengthen their assurance," &c. In the Larger Catechism, Question 32, we find in the answer to the question the following statement, "The grace of God is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation by him; and requiring faith as the condition to interest them in him, promiseth and giveth his Holy Spirit to all his elect, to work in them that faith, with all other saving graces; and to enable them unto all holy obedience, as the evidence of the truth of their faith and thankfulness to God, and as the way which he hath appointed them to salvation." When we look at the 18th chapter of the Confession, entitled assurance of grace and salvation, we find these statements:—"Although hypocrites, and other unregenerate men, may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions of being in the favour of God and estate of salvation; which hope of theirs shall perish; yet such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus, and love him in sincerity, endeavouring to walk in all good conscience before him, may in this life be certainly assured that they are in the state of grace, and may rejoice in the hope of the glory of God; which hope shall never make them ashamed. This certainty is not a bare conjectural and

probable persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope ; but an infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which these promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God : which Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption. This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties, before he be partaker of it : yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain thereunto. And therefore it is the duty of every one to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure ; that thereby his heart may be enlarged in peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, in love and thankfulness to God, and in strength and cheerfulness in the duties of obedience, the proper fruits of this assurance : so far is it from inclining men to looseness." Look also at the 80th and 81st questions in the Larger Catechism, " Such as truly believe in Christ, and endeavour to walk in all good conscience before him, may, without extraordinary revelation, by faith grounded upon the truth of God's promises, and by the Spirit enabling them to discern in themselves those graces to which the promises of life are made, and bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace, and shall persevere therein unto salvation." " Assurance of grace and salvation not being of the essence of faith, true believers may wait long before they obtain it ; and, after the enjoyment thereof, may have it weakened and intermitted, through manifold distempers, sins, temptations, and desertions ; yet are they never left without such a presence and support of the Spirit of God as keeps them from sinking into utter despair."

Now, we have been told, in the printed answers to the libel, and in the pleadings at the bar, that there is no faith without the assurance of salvation. I should only fatigue you by reading farther, and I shall merely turn your attention to one other quotation—the answer to the 172d question in the Larger Catechism, and I will point out the consistency between the Larger Catechism and the Directory to Public Worship, in that part relating to the administration of the Lord's Supper: “One who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, may have true interest in Christ, though he be not yet assured thereof; and in God's account hath it, if he be duly affected with the apprehension of the want of it, and unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ, and to depart from iniquity: in which case (because promises are made, and this sacrament is appointed, for the relief even of weak and doubting Christians) he is to bewail his unbelief, and labour to have his doubts resolved; and, so doing, he may and ought to come to the Lord's supper, that he may be further strengthened.” You will find in the Directory, that the minister, after warning all the profane, &c. not to presume to come to that holy table, is enjoined, on the other hand, “in an especial manner to invoke and encourage all that labour under the burden of their sins, and fear of wrath, and desire to reach out unto a greater progress in grace than yet they can attain unto, to come to the Lord's table; assuring them, in the same name, of ease, refreshing, and strength to their weak and wearied souls.”

“This language, which we find in our Standards, and if we attach any meaning to words, surely this is directly opposite to all that we have heard, on this subject, in the answers, and to all that has been argued at your bar. The question is, whether the parties who have addressed you from the bar are right or wrong? Are we to take our own Standards as the authority by which we are to try them? Either they

or our Standards—the one or the other must be wrong. But when persons came forward openly with a libel, laying it to the charge of our brother that he had taught this doctrine, we had just to ask, is this the doctrine of the Church or not? The Church declares in express terms, that assurance is not of the essence of faith; and is it to be permitted that this doctrine, which the Church has so directly condemned, is to be zealously inculcated by a member of this Church? From the beginning to the end of the Scriptures we never find them saying that assurance of salvation is of the essence of faith. Were this the case, it would be indifferent for the sacred writers to exhort the unconverted either to believe in Christ, or in their own salvation. So far is the Bible from encouraging this, that you never find the assurance of salvation substituted for the exercise of faith. The essence of faith is represented as the soul's receiving the Saviour; it is resting and trusting in him, and parting with all for his sake.

I am unwilling to trespass on your time: you are too perfectly masters of the subject to require any further address from me. Any individual who can take the Scriptures in his hands, and maintain such a doctrine as Mr. Campbell has done, has a mind so formed that I cannot easily comprehend how it arrives at such a conclusion.

If Mr. Campbell has been misrepresented by the press, as he seems to think, he has had the power of defending himself by the press, and removing such misrepresentations. And he has availed himself of the press for this purpose, for he has published his answers, which I now hold in my hand, and he has printed the proof. We have also a volume of his Sermons. A variety of information has been laid on our table. All of us have had the printed documents, and we have used them; and in a variety of ways we have had his opinions brought before us. It has been a painful business—a disagreeable matter from beginning to end. I was pre-

sent at every ~~shift~~ from beginning to end, except for two hours at Helensburgh; and I can assure this Court, that the greatest patience was manifested by the Presbytery throughout the long sederunts which we had. All attempts to keep the question out of Court were of no avail; indeed it was quite impossible: and, from the specimen which you have had this day, you must have seen that you would, in our situation, have been forced to take the very measures which we have taken. The case was managed by counsel in the Presbytery; and it would have been well for my young brother if he had committed his case to counsel altogether; for such an address, by a person in his accused situation,—attacking the very standards which he subscribed—attacking the compilers of the Westminster Confession—accusing them of travelling back to Popery, and reintroducing the exploded tenets of the Romish Church—such an address, I say, I never expected to hear. If he thought this the way to bring his case to a successful termination, I cannot see the ground of his expectation. I conclude with saying, that every attempt that has been made to bring him round to the tenets of the Church, has been more and more disappointing.

Dr. Fleming of Old Kilpatrick.

Moderator, I crave your indulgence for a few minutes. A very solemn appeal has been made to you, calling you to consider that you are sitting in judgment on the word of God, and that this word of God is to judge ~~you~~. I am perfectly sure that one and all of us feel, that we lie under a heavy responsibility as to the great duty we are discharging. But, Sir, you are sitting there as Moderator of one of the Courts of our national establishment. The Ministers of our Church are secured in the emoluments of their office, on condition that they properly discharge their duties as Ministers of this national Church. Now, Sir, the complaint in this case is, that the contract has not been complied with—that the terms

of it have been grossly and violently broken. The parishioners of Row charge their Minister with preaching doctrines that are contrary to the Holy Scriptures, contrary to the Confession of Faith, and directly condemned by the Act of the General Assembly of 1720. They called on us to hear proof of these charges, and on these charges being proved, they called on us to proceed to depose him from his pastoral office. Now, Sir, I think you must see very plainly, and at once, that the only fair and conclusive arguments that can be used are not so much to be drawn from the Scriptures, as from the interpretation given of these Scriptures by the Church, and ratified by the State. It is as members of an established Church that the matter has come before you. The title of the pursuers to originate and insist in this case, arises not from the Scriptures at large, but from the interpretation of these Scriptures by the Church, and the ratification of that by the State; and the defender can have no other defence but to shew that the doctrines which he has taught are not contrary to the Standards: and I am afraid that any judgment pronounced on any other grounds would be altogether inept. I am perfectly willing to admit—no one is more willing than I am—that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and morals. But I ask, what Bible? What faith? Not the Bible of the Papists—not the faith of the Papists—for you deny their doctrines. The Church has specified distinctly what books contain the word of God; and she has also stated the doctrines which, as contained in the word of God, we are to teach. • I am sure this Court will see the propriety of adhering most closely to the interpretation given by our Church; any other mode of proceeding would lead to inexplicable confusion. I am sure that no one will, even for the sake of argument, surrender this valuable declaration, handed down to us, sealed by our forefathers' blood; but that the members of this Court will rally, as one man, around it, to rescue and uphold our insulted Standards—



Standards which I hope will continue, without rent or stain, to wave in unsullied purity over the heads of many faithful and obedient generations of our countrymen.

But what are the Standards of the Church? I put this question for the purpose of confining the discussion, which has already been too wide on this subject. I have carefully examined all the documents that are considered of public authority in the Church of Scotland; and when I speak of the documents of public authority, I speak of them as ratified by the State. Now, these are the only documents I can find as of public authority. There is, first of all, the Scottish Confession of 1560; then the Second Book of Discipline; (the first was never ratified by act of Parliament) then you have the National Covenant of 1560; then the Solemn League and Covenant; these are the only documents of authority, previous to the Westminster Confession.

\* The Geneva Confession, quoted at your bar, I deny to be authorized. It was never sanctioned by the State, and as soon as the Church proceeded to draw up the Scottish Confession, it was laid aside. And, Sir, mark the difference between the two. In the 9th article of the Scottish Confession, it is said that Christ made full satisfaction for the sins, not of all the world, but for the sins of *the people*; so that the Scottish Church has, from the first, set her face most distinctly against the doctrines of the Geneva Confession on this subject.

But I now proceed to make some remarks on the complaints made at the bar of the unconstitutional use that has been made of an act of Assembly in the libel. The objection amounts to this, that as this act has reference to matters of doctrine, it could not be reckoned binding until the majority of the Presbyteries had approved of it, agreeably to the provisions of the Barrier Act.

If I understand the subject at all, we have in the Church three kinds of law—statute law—the law of declaratory acts

—and the law of decisions. The first of these is the only one that comes under the barrier act. The barrier act is strictly and properly, an act to prevent innovations on the constitution of the Church ; and it is only when a new law is proposed, affecting some important part of our ecclesiastical constitution, that the consent of the majority of the Presbyteries of the Church is at all necessary. Any matter of emergency is easily provided for by a declaratory act. The law of decision again draws general results from particular cases, and thus a single decision may come to have the force of a law. The act of 1720 partakes of the nature both of a decision and of a declaratory act, and has nothing in it to bring it under the operation of the barrier act. It partakes of the nature of a decision, because it pronounces an opinion upon a particular case. It adds nothing to the doctrines of faith formerly received by the Church, but *declares* that these opinions are contrary to the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church, and thus is it a declaratory act. Now, to say that this cannot be done by the Church, is to say that the Church has it not in her power to lift her testimony against error. And in these days, when the errors that prevail in summer may be falling into the sear and yellow leaf in autumn, an error might be extinct before our distant brethren could give an opinion of it. This would, in effect, be tying up the hands of the Church altogether. The General Assembly has repeatedly assumed the power of speaking against prevailing errors, and has never felt that that power was in the slightest degree impaired by the barrier act. See the 5th Act of Assembly, 1698.—You have there a distinct condemnation of a sermon published by a minister. In 1701, you have a distinct condemnation of the errors of Arminianism. In 1707, the Assembly enjoined all Presbyteries to take notice of books published by ministers, and to censure any thing contrary to the rules of the Church.

It has been contended that the Act of Assembly, founded

on in the libel, is an insulated and hasty decision—that it was deplored at the time—and that it ought to be repealed. As to any lamentations of this kind, I have not been able to discover any traces of them. As to the condemnation of that Act, quoted from a high authority, calculated to produce an erroneous impression on the minds of the Court, as coming from the mind of Dr. Thomson, I am sure that the Court only entertains one opinion of it. He states that the excitement about the Marrow, led to unsound declarations. By whom were these declarations made? Certainly Dr. Thomson never meant thus to speak of the Act of Assembly; but, on the contrary, of those who opposed that Act. In the extract that was read, there is nothing said against the principle of the Act itself.

I should like, before sitting down, to state the history of the act. In 1718 a book was published, called the Marrow of Modern Divinity, with a recommendatory Preface by Mr. James Hog. We find that two years after, (1720) a standing Committee had been appointed by the Commission, and that they had presented to the Assembly some quotations from the book; and it appears, from pamphlets published at the time, that great care was employed in the consideration of this case. A diet was appointed, wherein all, not merely members but others, had access to propose what they had to aver in defence of the “Marrow of Modern Divinity;” and there Mr. Hog was fully heard and answered. Queries were put to the supporters of the Marrow, and answered; and the Assembly, having had the matter fully under consideration, in 1722, passed another Act explaining the Act of 1720, vindicating it from misrepresentations that had been cast on it, and stating the sentiments that ought to be deduced from the act.

These are points that were deeply and maturely considered; and, although these acts be the only distinct and positive declarations, you cannot fail to perceive that there was a

deep under current of deliberation running throughout the Church for several years preceding: and instead of being a hasty and ill-considered decision, it was the solemn and deliberate result of the deliberations to which it refers.—So solemn and deliberate, that it has settled the peace of the Church, which has never been agitated on this subject from that day till now. And now, that you should be called upon to set it aside, in this hasty way, as you have been called upon from the bar, is to me surprising; and it is a proposal that I cannot suppose you will listen to.

I do not mean to say any thing in reply to what fell from Mr. Campbell in the other parts of his address. The Presbytery considered the charges in the minor proposition with the utmost patience, and purged them of every thing that did not appear to them to bear on the major proposition. If there be still any thing in them that does not apply, let it be expunged—we are most anxious that it should be done.—Indeed, most gladly would we see it done away with altogether. But this cannot be, for the defender not merely admits the charges, but he glories in them, so as to bring me in mind of the proverb, *raro vidi ecclesiasticum penitentiam*; but, even at this twelfth hour, we are willing to receive him, if you can show us how to do it in consistency with the safety of the people, and with the discipline of the Church.

Mr. Story, in reply, again contended that, even assuming the authority of the Act of Assembly, 1720, which he could not admit, the doctrines libelled, as explained by Mr. Campbell—the only explanations before them—differed widely from the doctrines condemned by that Act. He read some expressions in the Act describing the doctrines condemned, and thence argued that, whatever authority this Act had, the Church had never pronounced a judgment upon the doctrines of the appellant.

He stated that the Act of Assembly, 1722, allowed that the appropriating act is of the very nature of faith, which is, in fact, another name for the perception and belief of the love of God in Christ. He said, "When a man believes any thing, he appropriates it to himself. Every communication from God is a dead letter to me, until I see that the communication has a reference to my own condition. When it is declared, in Scripture, that God has given to us eternal life, this is to me a dead letter, till I recognise that it is a gift bestowed upon me. It is in this sense that I say that assurance is of the essence of faith—this is what is held, and it is in perfect accordance with the Standards of the Church, and owned by the Act of 1722, already referred to."

He shewed that that Act of Assembly also owned that there is a gift bestowed on man, and that there is a warrant given to every minister to preach Christ, or to offer Christ to every individual, and that each individual has a warrant to receive him; and he asked how could this be the case, or how there could be any such warrant, if the barrier was not taken away—if there remained any other barrier than the creature's unwillingness to receive Christ.

He said that he felt it necessary to say a few words, in order to fill up the narrative of the proceedings in this case, that had been given by a Rev. Doctor at the bar; and while so much sympathy was expressed for the parish of Row, and while it was stated, that memorials and petitions had been presented from the parishioners, imploring the Presbytery to proceed against their minister; it was surprising that no allusion had been made to the number of the petitioners. To the first petition, there were only two or three names; and to the last, only twelve; and the Rev. Doctor had also forgot to state, that, on both these occasions, numerous signed petitions had been presented to the Presbytery from the parishioners of Row, praying the Presbytery to do

nothing that could tend to weaken the hands of a minister who was so zealous, and to whom they were so much attached.

Mr. Story also stated, that the reason why he dissented, when it was proposed to ask the memorialists against Mr. Campbell, whether they were willing to convert their memorial into a libel, was, that the Presbytery would not agree to make any inquiry into the character or religious knowledge of the individuals. He said that he meant to cast no imputation upon their characters; but he conceived that, before permitting them to libel, the Presbytery were bound to see whether they were fit persons to come forward with such a libel—whether they knew what was truth, and what was error.

He concluded by entreating the court, (in reference to other events, to which Dr. Graham had alluded, and which he had connected with the appellant's teaching,) to remember, that in judging of this case, they were bound to judge entirely upon the documents on their table.

Before parties were removed, Dr. P. Macfarlane asked, at whose desire the alterations were made on the 10th count, in the minor proposition of the libel—whether by desire of Mr. Campbell, or the libellers, or by the Presbytery of their own accord; and was answered that the alterations were made by the Presbytery, because they did not find that count relevant as it stood, and so struck out the matter that was not relevant.

Parties being removed, Dr. HILL of Daily, a member of the Synod, spoke as follows.

Moderator,—I agree very much with many of the exceedingly judicious observations made by a Rev. Dr., on the foul objections that have been made in regard to the standards of our church. I should have been happy if the discussion

had been confined to those Standards ; but I would not like, since the discussion has taken so wide a range, that it should go forth to the world, that there is so much support given to the appellant's doctrine, by the document which he has laid upon the table ; and I shall therefore go more fully into the matter, and show how very little foundation he has. The appellant complains of the indefiniteness of the charges made against him. The libel charges him with holding the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, and he appears not to know what meaning should be affixed to these terms ; although the common use of language shows plainly enough what is their meaning. But I do not think, Sir, that *he* has a very good right to complain of the indefiniteness of the language used against him ; for if you attend to his answers, which I shall chiefly go upon, you will find that he does not adhere to the limited meaning he chooses to affix to the term pardon. In fact, all the illustrations which he brings from Scripture, to show the extent of the atonement, go the length of establishing universal pardon, and certainly entitle us to consider him as holding that tenet in the largest sense which we can fix to the term. But I wish rather to take his own meaning, and look on pardon as the removal of a barrier, to a sinner's returning to the light of God's love and favour—and I wish to consider, how this idea of the death of Christ, as removing this barrier to a sinner's returning to the enjoyment of God's favour, agrees either with Scripture, or the Standards of our church.

Sir, I have been always accustomed to think that if there be any one point upon which the Scriptures and the Standards are more pointed than another, it is the sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ. It is perfectly complete and available for the purpose for which it was offered. It does not effect that purpose only in part. It takes away sin, and it takes it away altogether. It does not merely remove a barrier, but it produces a reconciliation on both sides. Its

fruit is not merely pardon of sin, but the communication of every spiritual blessing which is essential to the present peace or everlasting welfare of man. This I look on as the established doctrine, both of the Scriptures and our Standards, in regard to the sacrifice of Christ; and I never have felt greater satisfaction than in looking over the old Standards, to see this idea so completely brought out by them. It is the only view of the sacrifice of Christ that is fitted to give security to a sinner, and that is consistent with the dignity of him by whom it was offered. If the sacrifice of Christ is deficient in any respect—if it only removes a barrier without bringing us into the favour of God—if it only produces a favourable disposition towards man on the part of God, without enabling man himself to return to God, what benefit is that to him? He remains in the same state in which he was. It is not sufficient for his wants. I think such a description of the sacrifice of Christ is derogatory to the character of him who gave himself a sacrifice and a sweet smelling savour unto God. And I trust we shall not give our sanction to such a view of the sacrifice of Christ as seems not to ascribe to it all the efficacy and completeness which the Scriptures and Standards assign to it—which robs it of its real efficacy, which disparages the atonement—which gives a mutilated character to the work of our redemption.

Again—looking at the view of pardon laid down by Mr. Campbell, I think he appears to overlook another doctrine, to which both our Standards and the Scriptures give a peculiar prominence, and that is the impotency of the human will. I need not remind you that in our Confession of Faith we are said to be “indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil.” If that be the state of man, something more is necessary than merely to have a favourable disposition on the part of God to him. He must have the willingness to return to God; and where comes it from, if there is only the removal of a barrier between him and



God. ~~Man cannot~~, of himself, move a step to his Creator. "No man cometh unto me except the Father who hath sent me draw him;" and yet you find Mr. C. speaking in his answers of man's *availing himself* of ~~that~~ title to come to God, which he holds to be ~~common to all~~. in consequence of the death of Christ; and he makes the difference between unbelievers and believers, to consist in the one taking advantage of his title of so coming to God, and the other not taking advantage of it. Now, there is a sad confusion in his ideas; for he must suppose our Standards to be altogether wrong, or he must admit that the pardon, of which he speaks, includes more in it than the removal of the barrier, and is in effect also the communication of spiritual blessings. It is the doctrine of our Church that all spiritual blessings are conferred on the people of God, in virtue of the sacrifice of Christ; and that this sacrifice was offered only for the elect. I will not stop to dwell on the doctrine of election. It has been much spoken of to-night already; but I cannot ~~help~~ saying, that as that doctrine is really the leading doctrine of our Confession, so it holds the very first place in our Confession, being the third article in it. It precedes the articles on creation, the fall of man, the covenant of grace. Every thing seems, by the Confession, to be included in God's eternal decree—all that takes place on earth is included in that decree; and it tells that some are predestined to everlasting life, and others to everlasting death; and then, in the following articles, that the former are chosen in Christ, and that it was for them he died, and for them he was made a perfect sacrifice. Now, the doctrine of election being thus the key to the whole of the Confession, is not the result of any thing foreseen as about to happen, nor the result of any thing that had actually happened. And when it is said in our Confession that the elect people of God are redeemed by Christ—when we are told that they are made able to believe, and

so made capable of enjoying all blessings, is it possible for us to think that the Confession, at the same time, contemplates some thing ~~private~~ and different from this election—that it exhibits God ~~to us~~ as choosing some to everlasting life, and yet, removing the barrier between himself and others whom he had foreordained to everlasting death—that it contemplates an universal atonement through the death of Christ? Sir, what is this but to exhibit to us the God of grace and of truth as deluding his creatures. We are told, however, from the bar, that the Confession of Faith relates only to the elect—here we are agreed. The Confession, they admit, speaks only of the elect, but says nothing as to the work done for the non-elect—it is silent in regard to them. Silent! Sir! If it is silent its silence is more expressive than any words that ever were spoken. I cannot read the Confession without the deepest conviction that by it the atonement of Christ is limited to the elect. That is unquestionably the impression which it conveys from beginning to end. And with that impression on our minds, is it possible for us to think, that it can have been intended, that our Confession should be *silent* on the subject of universal pardon. If that had been the case—if, while holding language, the whole tenour of which conveyed the idea that God, in the exercise of his sovereignty, and his grace, gave his Son for the redemption of his people—if while it was, in the whole tenour of its language, conveying this impression, it was, at the same time, harbouring some other idea with regard to God extending his favour to all, there would have been a disingenuousness in our Confession most unworthy of our Church; and, instead of being a declaration to our people of the tenets which we hold, it would be fitted to deceive them as to the nature of these tenets. I look on it as the gravest charge that could be made against our Confession by any member of our Church, to say, as has been said this night, that the Confession is silent on the subject of universal par-

don. Supposing that universal pardon is entitled to the pre-eminence that is given to it by the Reverend Appellant, that it is so important that to deny it would be little short of solemn apostasy, then our Church has been unfaithful, and all our distinguished ministers, in ancient and modern times, have been unfaithful stewards of God's word; for what voice has been lifted up to proclaim this tenet of universal pardon, as the doctrine of our Church. How completely have the people been kept in ignorance of this tenet, if it is so important; for, according to the Reverend Appellant the Confession is silent on it, and our people know nothing of it. I marvel that when he said this it did not lead him to infer that he must be wrong in his idea of the light in which our Church regards this doctrine: for, whatever he may think of the ancient Confessions which he brought forward, they are laid aside, in regard to the Church in general. Who among our people thinks of looking at them? Another has been substituted in their place.

It is stated, that this new Confession is in nothing contrary to the former Confession, but agreeable to it; and, therefore, no inquiries are made into the former; and, from the one end of Scotland to the other, all the ideas formed, as to the views of our Church, are derived from the Westminster Confession. Is such a state of things, that which would have been permitted to remain had not the Confession been explicit upon every point that it was important for our people to know; ask, Sir, our elders and people, what they think of the doctrine of universal pardon, and they will tell, with scarcely a dissentient voice, that, whatever may be said of it, it is not the doctrine of our Church. And they are right, Sir. Is the Confession silent when it says, "Some men are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others are foreordained to everlasting death?" Is it silent when it says, "Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his

Spirit working in due season ; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation, Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

—"The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice?" Is it silent, Sir, in such expressions as these, and in many others which I might quote? But, to my mind, there is nothing more clear than that which I have read, and which was well commented on at the bar, by members of the Presbytery. In this 6th section of the 3d chapter of the Confession of Faith, we are taught, that the elect of God are appointed unto glory from all eternity—they who are elected, it might have been supposed, would have been kept free from all manner of evil—would be preserved from that common ruin in which the children of Adam are involved;—but we find that they, being fallen in Adam, means are provided for their being brought to glory; for they are redeemed by Christ—they partake of the benefits which God, in his infinite mercy, foreseeing the fall, had secured for them; and neither are any other redeemed by Christ. I will not dwell on explaining the word redemption, on which much stress has been laid, very unnecessarily. I might appeal to all theological writers on the subject for its meaning, and to none more readily than to President Edwards.

(Here the Rev. Doctor read an extract from President Edwards' works; but as he did not mention the place from which it was taken, we are unable to give it here.)

Now, Sir, according to this explanation of redemption, it is quite manifest that if we apply it to that article, to which I have been alluding, there is a positive exclusion of any but the elect from sharing in the interposition of Christ.

But, then, Sir, we are told, that we must explain the Confession by a reference to former Confessions, which are very explicit, it is said, in supporting the doctrine of universal pardon. Now, Sir, it is by no means fair to pick out a passage here and there from either these old Standards, or from any work whatever, and hold up the isolated passages; or words, as containing the doctrine referred to, in their detached form, and away from the train of thought in which they were introduced. We have have had too much of this already to-night. I heard with pain, Sir, passages taken from the works of well-known authors, whose sentiments there can be no doubt are opposed to the tenets under review, and these passages held up as supporting the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon. But most of all did I listen with pain to the extracts made from the works of that distinguished individual, whose sudden removal from this world cast a greater gloom over the land than any similar event has ever occasioned, and whose death is a loss of no ordinary kind to our national Church. Sir, considering the very prominent part which he took in the discussion of these very doctrines, and the decided opposition which he gave to them, I must say, that it seemed to me indecent to bring forward any isolated passages from his works, even had the passages quoted been infinitely stronger than they were, in support of these doctrines. I am sure that there was but one feeling of repugnance and scorn at the step which was taken in bringing these passages before you; and sure I am, that the Rev. Gentleman, instead of aiding his cause by this step, took the most effectual means to injure it, by bringing fully into our recollection the able and masterly exposure which he had made of this error, so prevalent among us.

Sir, in regard to Scripture, it is unwarrantable to take passages, as I have said these passages were taken—spiritual things must be compared with spiritual things. The meaning of one passage must be illustrated by another—the mean-

ing of one word must be discovered by its use somewhere else: and so with regard to the Standards also, we must not take particular sentences here and there, and take them away from the connexion in which they were placed, and then say they exhibit the doctrines of universal pardon and atonement. I shall notice some of those passages which have been taken. The first I notice is that from the Geneva Confession; from which a quotation is made in the answers, at the 58th page. It is there said, "Thus of his free mercy, without compulsion, he offered up himself as the only sacrifice, to purge the sins of all the world." There the sentence stops in the answers; but there the sentence does not stop in the Confession; and had it been prolonged, you would have found that the object of the Confession, here, was only to show the sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, and to expose the errors of the Roman Catholic church in regard to the Mass, and not at all to state any thing as to the extent of the atonement, for the words are, "He offered up himself as the only sacrifice to purge the sins of all the world; *so that all other sacrifices for sin, are blasphemous, and derogate from the sufficiency hereof.*" Now, Sir, I find another passage in this Confession, which I beg leave to read to the Synod, article II. "For when through our father Adam's transgression wee were become children of perdition, there was no meanes to bring us from that yoke of sinne and damnation, but onlie Jesus Christ our Lord, who giving us that by grace which was his by nature, made us through faith the children of God."

Now, I mark this passage, in order to shew you what Jesus Christ gave. He gave to be ours that which was his by nature, that we may be the children of God. And this is equivalent to deliverance from the yoke of sin and condemnation, and all this is obtained through faith. Now, Sir, can it be supposed that the Confession understands that there

is a possibility of deliverance from sin, without that deliverance issuing in our being the children of God. I might say also, from that same Confession, where it speaks of the duties of magistrates, "The society of Christes Church wherein standeth onlie remission of sinne purchased by Christ's blood, to all them that believe, whether they be Jewes or Gentiles."

Can there be a plainer statement than this, that remission of sins stands only in the church of Christ.

As to the Confession of 1560, you have a quotation from it on page 58th of the Appellant's Answers. "But yet we avow that he remained the only well-beloved and blessed Sonne of his Father, even in the midst of his anguish and torment quhilk he suffered in bodie and saul to mak the full satisfaction for the sinnes of the people." Here again is the sufficiency of Christ, and nothing more. But here is something more, for there is a connecting with the sacrifice of Christ the everlasting purgation and satisfaction which it has purchased—connecting with the death of Christ, not only the removal of a barrier, but blessings infinitely more valuable. This is all the Appellant has taken out of the Confession of 1560. But I think that Confession contains a great deal more in opposition to the doctrine of universal pardon. Here is a passage which should have satisfied the Reverend Appellant that he was wrong in his views. I think it was once read this evening, and I observed that no remark was made upon it. Now, the whole quotation is the 3d article, which is "Of original sin"—"Be quhilk transgressioun, commonlie called Original sinne, wes the Image of God utterlie defaced in man, and he and his posteritie of nature become enemies to God, slaves to Sathan, and servandis unto sin. In samekle that deith everlasting hes had, and sall have power and dominion over all that have not been, ar not, or sal not be regenerate from above: quhilk regeneratioun is wrocht be the power of the Holie Gost, working in the hartes of the elect of God, ane assured faith in the promise of God, re-

veiled to us in his word, be quhilk faith we apprehend Christ Jesus, with the graces and benefites promised in him."

Now, Sir, I hold this to be a most powerful statement to this effect, that none are pardoned but the elect—everlasting death never has been removed—never shall be removed from them that are not regenerated from above. Then, again, in the 8th article, which is about election—"And for this cause, ar we not affrayed to cal God our Father, not sa meikle because he hes created us, quhilk we have common with the reprobate; as for that, that he hes given to us his onely Sonne, to be our brother, and given unto us grace, to acknowledge and imbrace him for our onlie Mediatour, as before is said. It behooved farther the Messias and Redemer to be very God and very man, because he was to underlie the punischment due for our transgressiouns."

Now, Sir, I mark the passage, to show what is common to all men—God has created all men. But it is not common to all men that God is favourable to them. I would beg also to remark upon what is said in the Appellant's Answers, of God giving his only Son to be our brother, which is adduced as an argument—a strange one, I think—for universal pardon; from the idea that Jesus Christ is our brother—our fellow servant—and that, having thus come under the law of God, he was bound to love his neighbour—every man was his neighbour—so if he died for one, he must have died for all. It struck me when I read the Answers, that there was very considerable irreverence in this mode of arguing. I cannot help remarking on this perversion and misapplication of Scripture, in thus using the passage in 1 John iii. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." Who does not perceive, Sir, that the object of the Apostle is to magnify the love of God to us. He does it by contrast—not that we were in the relation of brothers to him who laid down his life for us, but that we were his ene-



mies ; and he goes on to reason from this, that we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But, Sir, when it is said that Jesus Christ was given to be our brother, this points to an intimacy of relation not formed between the Saviour and mankind in general. He is given to be our brother, and we are his brethren by our being the children of God. This, Sir, I hold to be agreeable to Scripture ; but it is unscriptural to call Jesus the brother of the ungodly. He took bone of our bone indeed ; but, says the Apostle, “ he that sanctifieth, and *they who are sanctified* are all of one : for which cause he is not ashamed to call *them* brethren.”

We had Calvin’s Catechism introduced on the subject of assurance. I shall read one or two passages from that Catechism :—

“ Q. What is the proper signification of this worde Remission ?

“ A. That God doeth freely forgive all the sinnes of them which beleve in him, in such sorte, that they shall never be called to any account, to receive any punishment therefore.

“ Q. Wherefore doest thou make mention of remission of sinnes, immediately after that thou hast spoken of the Church ?

“ A. Because that no man can receive forgiveness of his sinnes, unlesse he be joyned in fellowship of God’s people, and so continue in the unitie of Christ’s body even to the end, like a true member of his Church.

“ Q. Wherefore is there mention made of life everlasting, and not of hell ?

“ A. Because the Creede is a brief summe of our faith, containing in as few wordes as can be, that that belongeth peculiarly to comfort the consciences of God’s faithfull : therefore God’s benefites which hee freely bestoweth upon his people, be rehearsed onely, without any mention of the wicked, who are cleane shut out of his kingdome.”

Is this compatible with the idea of God’s being favourable

to all, or with the idea that sin is, in any respect, pardoned, or that the obstacle which sin occasions is in any degree removed, as to all men?

Much stress has been laid on the Palatine Catechism—on that part of it contained in answer to the 37th question of that Catechism. It was this quotation, I now recollect, upon which no remark was made. The question I meant to put was, “Why is not the whole answer given in the Appellant’s Answers, instead of a part of it?—for we have not the whole of the answer there. The conclusion of it is in these words: “That by his suffering, as by the only sacrifice of reconciliation, he might both deliver our souls from everlasting condemnation, and might also purchase for us the favour of God, righteousness, and everlasting life.” I never read a more conclusive quotation as to the complete efficacy of the death of Christ, and the benefit of his death being confined only to those who are reconciled—who are delivered from everlasting condemnation—and for whom not only the favour of God, but righteousness and everlasting life are purchased.

“First, of God we confesse three things, *to wit*, that he is our Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. Our Father we call him, and so by faith believe him to be, not so much, because he hath created us, (for that we have common with the rest of creatures, who yet are not called to that honour to have God to them a favourable Father) but we call him Father by reason of his free adoption, by the which he hath chosen us to life everlasting in Jesus Christ.”

If it were not trespassing upon your time we might refer, to show the meaning of our Confession on these points, to the history of those who drew up the Confession, whose characters have been too lightly treated; or I might refer to those who were the bosom companions of the Fathers of our Church—to Calvin, for example, in whose writings there are many passages opposed to the doctrine of universal par-

don. Neither will I stop to comment on Scripture—not that I think the Scriptures should be lightly passed over—it is by them that we should be guided—but I am perfectly satisfied with the explanation, brief as it was, given by a Rev. Dr. at the bar. He spoke of the principle that must guide us in that explanation. We must attend to the connexion in which the words stand—we must think of the purpose for which the sacred writers employ the expressions—and when we find general expressions requiring to be used in a qualified sense—when we find particular expressions bearing out the qualified sense in which the general expressions are employed—when we find Christ saying that he has come to give his life a ransom for *many*—when we find his love uniformly spoken of as not an ineffective love, but a love that, like himself, is the same yesterday and for ever—partaking of all his unchangeableness, and bringing them who are the objects of it to himself, and working in them and for them an eternal weight of glory. When this is the view that is given us in the Scripture of the love of the Saviour, shall we think that this love is exercised without any such fruits being the result of it? Are there not many passages in Scripture rigidly against universal pardon? Is not the Saviour represented to us as the Saviour *only* of them that believe? On these grounds, Sir, I can have no doubt as to the relevancy of the libel. Knowing that there may be other members of Court inclined to address you, I will not detain you longer than to express my acknowledgment for your indulgence, and to move that the judgment of the Synod be to dismiss this appeal, and affirm the sentence of the Presbytery of Dumbarton.

Dr. M'Farlane, of St. Enoch's.

I rise to second the motion, Moderator, now laid upon your table; and in doing so, I shall occupy but a very small portion of the time of this venerable Court, being anticipated in

what I would have said by my Rev. Friend before me, and by those who appeared for the Presbytery at the bar. I cannot give my sentiments on this subject, without expressing my deep regret that there should have been any cause for bringing this case before the consideration of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr. I regret that, when he has virtually acknowledged the truth of these charges, in his answers, he has not followed the dignified, and manly, and only Christian course, of resigning his office, instead of appealing from the judgment of the Presbytery. But I am still more surprised that he should come forward and defend himself in the manner he has done, by bringing, as much as possible, into public contempt the Standards of our Church, and those who made them. I shared in the feelings of my-brethren when he spoke of them who drew up the Westminster Confession. He has stated, Sir, that there was a compromise, on the part of the framers of the Westminster Confession, on the particular doctrines to which he has alluded. I challenge him to bring forward proof, and let him do so if he can; and I now take the opportunity, from all my recollections of the history of this transaction, to say, that there is not the slightest foundation for the charge brought against these venerable men.

In so far as the proceedings of the Presbytery of Dumbarton have been brought under our review, they appear to have been conducted in perfect order and regularity—I speak of what has been brought under review this day; because, as to some part of the subsequent proceedings, there may be some difference of opinion. I am happy to think, Sir, that amid the various observations that fell both from the Dissentient and Appellant at the bar, that there was not one complaint of the proceedings of the Presbytery previous to this libel.

Now, Sir, I have to express, in one word, my astonishment that they should have complained that there was any

want of intelligibility in the charges contained in this libel. They are as plain as words can make them ; and, Sir, he has abundance of explanation, if not in the major, at least in the minor proposition of the libel ; for there you find, Sir, a particular explanation of the charges contained in the major—and explanations so particular, that it was impossible for any man whatever to entertain two different opinions of the meaning of the charges in the major. Now, Sir, I shall just content myself with supplying one or two observations on this subject, in addition to those made by my Rev. Friend. In judging of the relevancy of any libel, you are to look to the Standards—to those Standards which the ministers of the Church have sworn to—to those, upon declaring his adherence to which, he takes his place as a minister of the Church of Scotland. Now, upon that ground, I say, as to the libel, that it stands or falls by the Westminster Confession of Faith.

There are two points in the major proposition : the first, that of universal atonement and pardon, and the second, that of the assurance of faith.

Now, Sir, with regard to the first, I beg leave to refer to the third chapter of our Confession of Faith, the sixth section, where it is said, “ as God has appointed the elect unto glory, so has he foreordained all the means thereunto ; wherefore, they who are elected ; being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ.” Now, the thing I call attention to, is the order in which these things stand. Again, turn to chapter 10th, on effectual calling, and you find, “ All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ ; enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God ; taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them an heart of flesh ; renewing their wills, and, by his almighty power, determining them to that which is

good; and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace." Then, again, in chapter 11, section 1, "Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by adopting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone: not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience, to them as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves; it is the gift of God." I have read these in the order in which they stand, to show the utter falseness of the foundation on which Mr. Campbell rests his doctrine, in that the love of God lies at the root of the whole scheme of redemption.

I now go on to the quotation so properly made by Dr. Hamilton—a quotation from the Larger Catechism, which is also one of the Standards of our Church—the answer to the 80th question of that Catechism, so far from saying that assurance of personal salvation is essential to faith, speaks of it as an attainment which *may* be made by those who see in their growth in grace, the evidence of their election. That is also the doctrine of Scripture. This is the doctrine of our Church on this subject; and if so, then unquestionably the other charge in the major proposition of the libel is relevant to infer the pains of ecclesiastical law.

But, Sir, we are told by Mr. C. that we are not required to comply with the Confession of Faith, except in so far as that Confession is agreeable to the Word of God. Unquestionably not, Sir. If he is convinced in his mind that there is any thing in the Confession of Faith that is inconsistent with the Word of God, by all means let him declare and promulgate this to the world. But then let him leave the

church of which this is the Confession, and let him not tell us that in these improving and liberal times we are not to put a stop to the march of knowledge in religion any more than the march of mind in other things. We may rejoice and be thankful that all the doctrines of the gospel are embodied in the articles of the Confession of Faith. Therefore it will not do for him to tell us that we must not judge him by that Confession. The doctrines he teaches were known long ago, and have only been revived by him; not knowing, perhaps, that they have been revived and exploded again and again.

I do not wish to occupy a moment longer, except for the purpose of referring to an attack made on a much revered individual, by a quotation, a partial quotation, from a volume of his Sermons. I rose, Sir, while that quotation was made by Mr. Story, for the purpose of enabling him to set himself right on that subject. I wished that he should manfully and honestly retract the charge which he had brought against our venerable and deceased friend, of being friendly to a doctrine which he knew well he had published a whole volume to overturn. I shall not read the note I referred to upon the present occasion, because I do not wish to put my reverend friend to shame before this venerable house. If he had read that note he would have found that, so far from being favourable, he was decidedly and most firmly opposed to these doctrines, and that it gives a full and complete exposition of his views on the subject: but I join in reprobating the effort to bring forward an individual to support a cause to which he is known to be decidedly hostile. Sir, we ought to have respect to the memory of the dead, at least as much as to the memory of the living. They are here no longer to defend themselves; and it is painful to have the memory of that great—that illustrious individual insulted, by making him appear to contradict himself, in a point on which, as on most every other with which his great mind grappled, he

entertained conceptions altogether consistent with the Scriptures of truth.

Dr. Dewar of the Tron Church.

Moderator,—An allusion has been made to me. Mr. Story has read a quotation from my work on the atonement, and, therefore, I think it necessary to tell you that I am not at all infected with what I have denominated in that book “a silly heresy”—and I not only used the words “silly heresy,” but I used it in reference to that very book to which my friend has alluded—one of the most masterly performances—the record of our late excellent friend’s opinion on this subject. I have said that that work of his “will be read when the silly heresy of which it is a triumphant refutation, will be forgotten.”

By the quotations made from the different books alluded to, perhaps the complainers intended to show the freeness of the gospel salvation. We hold forth the freeness of the gospel, as fully and freely as they do, though we are not infected with that silly heresy. There is a great deal of most important truth connected with that pernicious error. The freeness of the gospel salvation is the glory of the gospel of Christ; and Mr. Story said well and wisely, that he would give up the Church of Scotland sooner than give it up. He would not be solitary in that—he would get many others to join him—but the day will never come when a minister will have to leave the church simply for holding to the freeness and fulness of the salvation of the gospel.

I have only to say, that I must cordially concur with the very able statements made, by both my friends who have preceded me, regarding the atonement and universal pardon. As to the obstacle being removed, there are two senses in which the obstacle, or the barrier, may be asserted to be removed. It is quite scriptural to say, that the blessed Redeemer, by his death, has laid a foundation on which the



proclamation of mercy may be made to sinners without discrimination. If Mr. C. means to say, that that is all that he means by universal pardon, then he is most reprehensible for using language altogether out of its common meaning, and which he knows—could not but have known—must have conveyed a meaning directly contrary to what he intended to convey: and if this was his meaning, I would say that he is not fit to be a teacher of others.

But, in the second place, as to the barriers being removed, they are removed when the condemnation of the law is taken out of the way. But I presume that Mr. C. will not say, that the barriers are removed in that second acceptation of the word. Therefore, if the first is the meaning in which Mr. Campbell uses the word, then I say he is highly reprehensible on the ground of his using words altogether away from their common acceptation. But I believe he means more than this, and that he holds that the pardon is conveyed, in some way or other, to persons while they yet remain without an interest in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then, as to Confessions, Sir, I must make a remark upon them, because I conceive it of importance that such a sentiment should not go abroad, as that the ministers of this church are tied up and prevented from searching the word of God, and growing in divine knowledge, in consequence of their being bound to the Confession and catechisms of this church. Sir, we are not prevented from searching the Scriptures—it is because we have done so for ourselves, and come to the conclusion that these standards are founded in the Scriptures, that we have subscribed them. We have subscribed, because we have examined. And let it not be said in the 19th century, that there are new discoveries to be made. There are discoveries to be made in philosophy, but as to a revelation given by God, it is an absurdity to suppose it. If it be a revelation from God, and if it be intended for the instruction of mankind, it is an absur-

dity to suppose that there can be any fundamental principle of that religion now to be discovered; and, therefore, we are not to be making discoveries as to the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. These are things most surely believed by all true christians. I am far from saying, that there are not difficulties connected with some of the points in Scripture. I should be most reluctant to do so. But, when a man finds himself obliged to come forward publicly, and to denounce the doctrines of a Confession which he has solemnly declared was the confession of his faith—that he should be at liberty to subvert, in public and in private, these very doctrines, is contrary to the first principles of morals, because it is a breach, not merely of an ordinary engagement, but of man's vows before God—of engagements which he has taken in the most solemn of all circumstances—and the man who can be guilty of doing such a deed, and of attempting to cast a stigma on the illustrious characters who framed the Confession—I say that man has a heart and a mind very different from mine, and he acts on principles which I conceive to be at variance with the first principles of morals. I beg your pardon for continuing so long; but I must make another observation. Let it not be supposed that there is any persecution here. I feel many of the difficulties connected with these points: but when any member feels that he cannot subscribe our Confession, he is allowed, in this land of liberty, to withdraw. Let him do so, and hold these opinions with a good conscience: but it is impossible that we can allow any person to hold these opinions, and remain in the church.

The Rev. Mr. Wyllie of Carlisle, said, that he must dissent from this judgment of the Synod, for that he had been taught of God that these things were so. He said, that not one of these who had spoken appeared to him to have rightly understood Mr. Campbell.

He referred to the Act of Assembly, 1722, to shew that

an author's words are to be explained according to his own meaning; and yet, he said, members had spoken, one after another, about words, without taking any notice of Mr. Campbell's explanations. No imputation, he said, had been thrown on the character of the drawers up of the Westminster Confession. At that late hour, he said, he would not detain the Synod with any argument, either from the Scriptures or the Standards, but would content himself with entering his dissent and complaint to the next General Assembly, against the present judgment of the Synod.

To this dissent and complaint Mr. Morton, elder, from Carlisle, adhered.

The Synod adjourned at 8 o'clock on Thursday morning, till 11 o'clock of the same day.

---

Thursday the Synod met at 11 o'clock, and proceeded to take up the remainder of the case. Parties were heard upon the different appeals that had been taken upon various minor points; but as the members of the Synod gave no opinions respecting these points, and the Synod pronounced no judgment upon them, but referred them *simpliciter* to the ensuing General Assembly, it appears unnecessary to occupy room with these minor discussions.

The Rev. Mr. Story was heard in support of his dissent and complaint against the judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, pronounced on the 29th March, 1831, finding proven the libel against Mr. Campbell; but we have been unable to procure, in time for this publication, any report of Mr. Story's speech.

Thomas Carlyle, Esq. advocate, counsel for the appellant, was then heard. He spoke nearly as follows:—

Moderator;—Considering the somewhat peculiar circumstances in which this case comes before the Reverend Synod, under a remit from the General Assembly, touched in no

very ordinary phraseology,—considering the various proceedings which have, since then, accumulated, and which have been noised abroad from one end of this country to the other,—and considering, that while the labour at present undergone in their discussion is necessarily great, the total and ultimate labour is thus as greatly shortened,—I am now to crave the indulgence of the Synod, while I state the case of my client, upon the proof, as briefly as the nature of the subject admits, yet as fully as the vast importance of that subject demands.

I am afraid that I cannot sympathize in the sentiment thrown out by a reverend member of this court, that any discussion likely to take place upon this matter, in the prospect of a reference, would be a mere consumption of time; for whether the doctrines imputed to, or entertained by Mr. Campbell are right or wrong doctrines, the very discussion of such doctrines and such a charge, so weighty in their nature and consequences, can in no point of view be justly considered as a mere consumption of time.

I am also afraid, that as I am to enter into the merits of the proof adduced, I must continually deal with that proof; and, therefore, those Reverend members who may think that the matter of the charges and the proof is heretical, must necessarily hear what offends them, while I discharge my duty. I am any thing but indisposed to remember the suggestion so properly thrown out by the Reverend Principal, regarding the utter impropriety of alluding, in any way, to the relevancy of this libel, in arguing upon the proof; but if the questions to which I now address myself be concerning the living God; concerning his eternal truth, or that falsehood which cometh not of him (as every such questions must be,) most assuredly these are not mere questions of evidence, but also questions of theology, strictly so called. Because they are such questions, I have to crave the indulgence of the Reverend Synod while I discuss them. Yet, if I do depart in any degree

from the course proper to be pursued in the discussion, I shall feel most happy to receive any suggestions which may bring me back to that course.

Sir, the minor of this libel, the proof of which is now under consideration, is in no sense whatever to be considered as that which is to render the major intelligible. This I have seen repeatedly implied in the explanations attempted to be given to the major proposition, with a view to remove its strange ambiguities. But the law unquestionably is, that the relevancy of the major can be sought for only within its own limits—that the relevancy of the minor, a posterior question, depends upon the relation of that part of the libel to the major—and that, when it is decided that the major is relevant, and then that the minor, if proved, will establish it, the sole remaining question is, whether or not the minor be proved? And, in regard to this point, I cannot help advert-  
ing to an inconsistency in the deliverance of the Reverend Presbytery; because you perceive that they have not only come to certain findings on the various charges in the minor of the libel, but proceed to say, “in respect whereof find that the defender has entertained and promulgated” the two doctrines in the major—a finding wholly out of time and place, yet one the existence of which abundantly justified, nay, imperiously demanded, a reason of dissent and complaint by Mr. Story, which would have been otherwise incompetent.

I may also just advert, before proceeding farther, to a question put by a Rev. Dr. regarding the “productions in aid of proof,” referred to in the finding of the Presbytery. You will observe that my 9th reason of protest and appeal regards them. And, although I had no other evidence in support of it, I think I am entitled to throw myself upon the recollection of the reverend members of Presbytery, whether, in point of fact, any of these productions was publicly read before the Presbytery, so as to form a ground of judgment at their hands. Then, as to the minute which was

dictated by the libellers, and which Mr. C. entered on record at page 19 of the proof, to save their time and trouble, in the following terms, viz.—“It was here minuted, on the admission of Mr. C., that the three volumes, entitled numbers 1, 2, and 3, of Notes of Sermons by the Rev. J. M. Campbell, Minister of Row, Dumbartonshire, taken in short-hand and published at Greenock, and which are marked by the Moderator, are, to the best of his belief, what they profess to be”—as to this minute, I say, you will observe not only what he therein admits, but also what he does not admit, which last he notices, not that he is unwilling to avow whatever he may have preached—not that he is disposed to shrink from any thing contained in them,—but that he cannot admit any thing which does not strictly consist with his knowledge. They are productions by the libellers—and to the best of his belief, they are what they are entitled to be. He does not say that they are his sermons—he does not say that he revised them—that he read them over—that he superintended the printing of them—that he holds himself responsible for them as they stand. He simply says they are notes of his sermons taken in short-hand. Therefore, whatever weight is to be given to these productions in-virtue of this minute, is evidently to be limited by these important and evident qualifications.

Sir, you are aware that on a previous part of this day, I discussed a protest and appeal, on what I conceive invincible grounds, against the competency of taking proof at all regarding any part of the minor, but what lay within the ten specific charges. That appeal is already disposed of. But while it is so, the finding of the Presbytery necessarily leads to a farther remark—in reference to the same subject. It records the mind of the Presbytery upon the proof in support of the ten charges *seriatim*—but it regards nothing more in the minor. It does not say whether the first and general part of the minor is proved or not. The libellers have here

no appeal against the finding of the Presbytery, on the ground that it gives no decision on that part of the minor. Consequently, as the Presbytery has not found that general charge proven, it must be held as not proven. And, therefore, it is quite plain that the Reverend Synod, as a court of appeal, have no power now to find it proven. Thus the consideration of the proof comes to be considerably simplified, inasmuch as out of the luminous evidence before you, nothing which does not regard the ten specific charges in the minor can legitimately form the subject of deliberation by the Synod sitting as a mere court of appeal,—bearing in mind, however, this undoubted principle of law, that while the accusers cannot adduce, in support of a specific charge, evidence regarding the general teaching of the accused, in order to raise a probability that the charge is a true one—the accused has the liberty to adduce evidence regarding his general teaching, tending to show not merely the actual falsehood, but the improbability of the charge.

Now, Sir, you will observe, that, of these ten charges, part only are found relevant. The 7th has been found altogether irrelevant. Parts of the 1st, 2d, 9th, and 10th, have been struck out. And as to the 10th, in particular, which regards the same discourse as the 1st, I cannot but regret and feel astonished, that so many parts of it have been struck out as irrelevant, because what remains is so mutilated, as hardly to admit of a definite answer, and what has been struck out, besides being in many points similar to other parts of the libel, contains by far the nearest approximation to the true character of my client's teaching; as stated in his answers, and as appearing on the evidence, and so, on the supposition of his having taught heresy, would have thus furnished its most satisfactory establishment. Nine charges then, are, with certain deletions, sent to proof. And after that proof, two of these charges—the 3d and 5th, both relating to one discourse, have been found by the presbytery not proven. In regard

to these, I would deem it a total waste of time to use many words in favour of the Presbytery's decision. There are just three considerations which are conclusive on the subject. The first is, that they both relate to one particular sermon, libelled to have been preached on one or other of the days of October 1829, and that there is not one word of evidence in the whole proof regarding any such sermon preached within that month—the only month libelled, although there has been evidence led regarding a sermon preached in September of that year, lying wholly beyond the scope of these two charges. And it cannot be argued, that although they are not proven as constituting two out of the ten charges, they do, nevertheless, competently fall under the proof of the general charge; for the presbytery have not found any part of the general charge proven at all. Secondly, they are spoken to by only one witness for the prosecution. And lastly, the terms in which the charges themselves are couched, are those in which that one witness has given his deposition, and in a great variety of the most essential particulars, directly and overwhelmingly contradicted by the evidence of various witnesses for the defence. On the one hand, the charges state, that to seek an interest in Christ, and coming to Christ, are the same thing. The proof demonstrates Mr. C. to have taught that men have an interest in Christ, only in order that they may come to God through him. The charges identify that interest with our cure. The proof makes the former the opening for the latter. The charges represent the enjoyment of an interest in Christ as man's true blessedness. Mr. Campbell is proved to have uniformly taught a very different thing, viz., that our blessedness lay in the possession—not of any thing about Christ—but of Christ. The charges set forth the only cause of sorrow as dissatisfaction for not believing one's self in a state of favour with God. The whole evidence on the subject exhibits my client as teaching no such selfish doctrine, but the God glorifying truth that the only pro-



per subject of sorrow is sin—first in a man's ownself, and then in the world. And while the charges represent faith as the credit of a mere personal fact, and unbelief as its discredit—the evidence not only makes faith the yielding one's self to God in resting on Christ; and unbelief the active resistance of the Holy Ghost—but shows that a man may credit every fact as a mere fact in the catalogue of theology, and be no regenerate man at all. On the other hand, Dr. Burns, whose evidence stands alone, and forms a strange anomaly in the case, is yet more remarkably, nay, almost invariably contradicted.—While he represents Mr. C. as exhibiting, in the cross of Christ, a mere manifestation of love—all the other witnesses declare that there was as signally displayed God's eternal righteousness, and unalienable abomination of sin. While he dismisses all seriousness and mourning for sin from my client's views of faith, the evidence all consents at once in unveiling the delusion of a false seriousness, which many substitute for the knowledge of God, and also in showing that till a man believes God, he cannot either be truly serious, or mourn for sin with any understanding of God's mind concerning it. He makes unbelief the only sin which shall be judged. Mr. Campbell declares it to be a condition—and warns every man that he shall be judged for *every deed* by the Searcher of hearts. And, while Dr. Burns hazards an inference that Mr. Campbell's view of God's love was calculated to leave men easy in sin—almost every witness in the case seems, in proportion to his apparent acquaintance with the real meaning of sin, to have set it at the front of his testimony, that God's love was the utter condemnation of sin, and thence became a most unwelcome thing,—that those only who held salvation to be mere deliverance from wrath could conceive of that love as enabling unrenewed sinners to think more comfortably of a holy God—and that all who so thought, would, unless brought into the obedience of faith and patience of hope, be confronted, in

the day of Christ, not merely with the sentence of a sovereign, but with the wrath of the down-trodden Lamb. With these few remarks, I proceed to consider the seven remaining charges, as to which I think I may state without fear of contradiction, that the evidence led on both sides in regard to them, perfectly establishes the accuracy with which his answers to the libel represent his teaching during the year libelled—all that he has therein admitted, or voluntarily set forth, having been proved—and all that he has denied having been completely disproved. These seven charges may be ranked under two classes, viz. those that regard the extent of the atonement, and those that regard the doctrine of assurance. To the former class belong four—the 1st, the 2d, the 9th, and the 10th. Of these, the first and tenth are both drawn from one sermon, by a process and on a principle which might furnish any indefinite number of charges, seeing that the matter found relevant in the 10th, with the exception of the statement that all men are deserving of, and, by nature, under condemnation, (which is surely no heresy,) is fully embraced in the 1st. For this reason I shall address myself to the first only,—and in regard to it, the Reverend Synod will perceive that Mr. Campbell does not, in substance, deny its contents. But he maintains, that what the libel sets forth does not set forth the scope of the sermon libelled so fully as to contain any accurate representation of it. And, therefore, as I must now state it much more fully, and put the Synod in possession of his true teaching on that occasion, I would here premise what I have to say in regard to this charge, by just repeating, that I trust, is what I am now to remark, to be prevented from trespassing beyond the limits of the documents before the Court and the question of proof into the matter of relevancy, with which I have, at present, nothing to do.

I have already mentioned that the 10th charge contains one statement not embraced in the first, namely, that all are

deserving of, and by nature, under condemnation—a statement not a little remarkable, whether you consider the libel in which it has obtained and retained a place, the libellers who bring it forward, the misinformed public before whom it is brought, or its absolute contradiction of Dr. Burns' theories regarding Mr. Campbell's teaching—and his opinion that Mr. Campbell did not consider man as a guilty creature before God. Alas! it has been too generally circulated and believed, that my client did at the least treat lightly the great and fundamental fact, that all men are deserving condemnation, and by nature under it. And therefore I think it good to take this admission, nay, accusation on the part of the libellers, as my starting point. This first charge virtually resolves itself into three branches, (for the last clause is really embraced in the first.) And of these three branches the first is as follows:—"Before I can say to any man fear God and give him glory, I must know that his condemnation is taken away—that his sins are forgiven. It is a fact at this moment, of every person present, that his sins are put away; and if I did not know this, I could not say to you, fear God and give him glory, because that would be an impossibility." Now, remember that I am not considering the relevancy of such a charge, and I beg that I may be interrupted if I do. I am simply considering the question what Mr. C. meant by these words, or rather what he taught in that sermon from which these words are said to be extracted; and I am seeking to determine the question, by direct reference to, or necessary inference from, the documents before the Synod. The first question therefore is, what does the proof state as to Mr. Campbell's meaning when speaking of fearing God and giving him glory? If you will turn to p. 18, C. you will find from Mr. Cunningham's notes at the time, that "To fear God is to know and delight in him. To give God glory is to praise him. The liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, is a liberty to fear God and give him glory." Therefore, when

Mr. C. taught as charged above, he must be held to have meant—before I can bid a man know, delight in and give praise to God—before I can bid any man walk in the Lord Jesus Christ, and glorify the Father after his example, I must tell him that his condemnation is taken away, and his sins forgiven. Here is no Antinomianism, unless the knowing, enjoying, and praising God be an end different from the fulfilment of God's law. Mr. C. taught that God made man originally to enjoy and glorify him; for there is no blessedness but in God, and God is love. That was God's will or design in making man. But what has become of that design? What has become of it in the eyes of those who think that the will or design of God can never be defeated? Man's present condition by nature is the grand contradiction of it. But has God's will changed on account of that? God's will is the same; for it is his mind, and he is unchangeable. God's will is, that all be blessed, and that all be blessed in giving glory to him—he wills their happiness, and tells them that there is no happiness but in glorifying him. Now, this will of God is expressed in his law, which is just the expression of his holy mind. The blessedness of that law is the blessedness of those who do in themselves fulfil the design of God in them. And, therefore, the curse of that law, as abundantly appears from the evidence before the Synod, is the judicial and actual curse of having a mind contrary to the design of God, and of being in that awful condition, in contemplating which, God who cannot abide it, must, if he deny not himself, say, "Depart from me." Such, then, being the condition of every man by nature as a sinner deserving of condemnation and under condemnation, not only unwilling but unable, not only unable but unwilling, to give God glory any more, how is it that the fact of this condemnation being taken away, is indispensable to his being told to fulfil the gracious design of God again? Sir, when man departed from God, he departed from God and commended sin, by

virtue of two monstrous lies. The first—that God's law was not a righteous law, worthy and profitable to be obeyed. The second—that God was not righteous in inflicting the curse of that law. And now that all men are brought back into a condition of being at liberty, invited, and commanded once more to give God glory, it is in the name of Him who became flesh to give the lie to these two lies of Satan, namely, to proclaim in his obedience unto the death, and his putting away of sin by a sacrifice, that God's law was a righteous thing to be obeyed, and God's curse a righteous thing to be undergone. The death of Christ was God incarnate coming to fulfil his own law, coming to endure his own curse. It left God with no deficiency whatever of *good pleasure*. The Father was altogether well pleased in the Son, up to the full measure of God's own desire and design. The law of God, standing in the Father, and magnified by the Son in the power of the Spirit, had no farther controversy, by its original curse, with the *nature* of man—all taken up—all represented by the Son. Christ, in going to the Father, obtained liberty of access for the nature, as if no man in it had ever sinned. And the remaining controversy lies not with our nature, as if yet under that curse or sentence of banishment which Christ has borne and finished, but between God and sin-loving persons, who will not take the liberty to serve God in righteous peace, which Christ has obtained for them.

I feel that the proof in this case, (and when I do not refer to particular passages, I abstain from so doing only to save the time of the Synod,) has this striking peculiarity, that it never represents this great work in Christ, (a thing carefully to be distinguished from the work of the Spirit in the elect,) as the mere evolution of a fact—as the mere showing forth of power and decree, but also as the manifestation of a character,—that it makes God not merely a supreme being, with a holiness as supremely beyond apprehension as

the essence of his being, but the spiritual God, revealed in the definite and tangible reality of a moral character, exhibited in the relations and offices of the glorious Trinity, not merely for the apprehension of human reason, but for the consciences of sinners, and the condemnation of sin. Now Sir, this our God so loved the world—that world which knew not Christ when he came into it—that world which knoweth not, neither receiveth the Spirit of God—that world which Jesus came to save, but which rejects his testimony—that world which is no philosophical abstraction, but just the men, the women, and the children on this earth, from its beginning to its end, from pole to pole—that he gave up his Son to the death for them all. That love—that essential longing to bless,—not an approbation of the creature's evil condition, but the most emphatic condemnation of it as a thing horrible to abide in, does not lurk in the mind of God, but is altogether declared—does not float on mere words, but is stamped upon a person—does not appear on him as an inanimate picture, but was felt, and heard, and seen, and handled, in every thing done or borne by Him, who, from that love alone, declared the heart of the Almighty Father in the form of a meek and lowly, a faithful, yet a smitten servant. Could God have died, he would have died for pure love's sake to his enemies—very worms. He came in mortal flesh, and proved his love by death. Could men have slain God, they would have done it; for the fool saith, Let there be no God. And O, let no man call sin a passive thing, a misfortune, a weakness, a mere negation of virtue; for such it was, that, whenever God became incarnate, and capable of death, He, in whom stood the full impersonation of virtue, was slain by wicked hands, which would have annihilated the God of Heaven if they could.

There is, in the cross of Christ, no mere manifestation of love without a principle, without an object, without a sanction, a love, at best, half tolerant of sin, as something which

is no more than a misfortune. No; there were seen at once the consummation of the hatred of men—the consummation of all things which God hated—and the consummation of God's yearning desire, to see all men rid and parted from the thing which he eternally hateth. This is the way in which God, who would have been most righteous in saying to all men, "Depart from me," did, by his own act in sending forth his Son from Heaven, put himself in a condition of being righteous, in saying to all men, "Come to me, and so live." Of this universal invitation, (so far from its not being discoverable,) the whole constitution of things gives incessant notice, as shall abundantly appear at that great day, when Christ, the Judge, shall testify that he hath been a ransom for all. God hath not left himself without witness, *i. e.* he hath not left Christ—for in him alone is God to be known at all. By Christ were all things made—they are upheld by the word of Christ's power. He was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world, just that he might be in all things the Mediator from the moment of the fall—God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses. If God were now imputing trespasses, he would not be just and true, unless he *strictly dealt with them as trespassers*—and how the holy and just God can deal with them as such, except by destroying them, I find not a word in this proof to show. It is because God is dealing with man, as under the righteous one, that he is not destroying man. This interest all men have—not the regeneration glory of having the Holy Ghost dwelling in them, as the support of life unto God, as the spirit of love, of truth, of hope, but that gracious constitution of all men under Christ, (to the intent that God may not consume them till Christ's judgment commence;) for which the apostle, in the epistle to Timothy, bids the saints *give thanks* unto God on behalf of *all men* in this day of grace. Every thing that daily befalls men, is a testimony unto them that

God is in Christ of a truth, not imputing to, or reckoning against them their trespasses. If they can righteously receive without Christ nothing but that curse into which their own act has perverted the gracious and beneficent law of God—and if good things come to them nevertheless, sure we may be, that under the government of a holy God they come in no arbitrary way; but just because the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world, is the mediator between God and man—a real, and not a merely possible mediator. The 19th Psalm, quoted in the 10th of Romans, the 14th and the 17th of Acts, the 1st, 2d, and 11th of Romans, and various other Scriptures, show that every thing—every act and gift of God in Christ, upholding all things by the word of his power, is, to every man, whether or not he receives it, a demonstration of Christ, although the Spirit alone can make that demonstration saving. For, where else—in whom else is the invisible Godhead to be known and recognised, save in the incarnate Word, the only declarer. I know not, Sir. All the blessings we enjoy as sinners; the sun and rain, and fruitful seasons which we despise; the comfortable meals which we so independently and unthankfully eat; the creatures of God we so daily abuse; that sweet repose we nightly sink into, oblivious of him that watcheth; all those thousand accommodations we daily riot over as spendthrift lords, all come from God, revealed in Christ. Therefore, they all bear witness—all teach concerning Christ. They all make men responsible (we shall not here consider the degrees) for receiving or rejecting Christ. Otherwise, God would have said, that all his dealings may, with impunity, be held meaningless, or may declare him without Christ—the glad tidings. In Christ alone is God known. By Christ alone was the world made. By him alone upheld—that Christ who is the Christ—the eternally anointed messenger of the Father. God out of Christ is no where to be found—God in Christ is set forth throughout the whole Scriptures of



truth, as he is throughout all this proof, in no character but a character of love to all men, until that day, (how near no man knoweth, for it is in the Father's power, although now near it seems to be,) when the eternal wrath of the Lamb shall be kindled to consume. Be the word pardon a right or a wrong word, (and that is not an important question here, because it is so abundantly and constantly explained in the evidence, in accordance with Mr. Campbell's answers, that no man can misunderstand its acceptation,) be it, I say, a right or a wrong expression, this pardon, forgiveness, or remission of sin by the Father—not reconciled, but reconciling—this constitution of all things in the hands of a mediator—in the hands of the Lamb slain, not even at, but before the foundation of the world—that, when it fell, it might fall into the arms of the Lamb, into the grace of God in Christ, therein to abide, until its provocation of the spirit of grace shall arouse the arm of the Lord from its slumber—this is the glorious truth which, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, he that would bid fallen men fear God, and give him glory, must previously know, not as a piece of information, but as a matter of life and godliness. Unless it were true, that God in Christ were to every man speaking words different from those of the law, "Depart with sin for ever," men would never have the option of again fearing him and giving him glory. And to bid men do that which they had no liberty, in consistence with God's righteous dealing, to do, would be, indeed, to command a thing impossible.

The second branch of this charge is as follows, viz., "I could not conceive any thing that I could ask of God which he has not told me, that he has already given me." The only objection I have to at once admitting this branch of the charge, is,—that considering what man is by nature, and what he is continually tempted to be though in a state of grace, I see herein no statement, that the things which the man is to conceive or ask shall be things according to

the mind of God. But one of the witnesses as to this charge expressly states this, as Mr. C.'s meaning and teaching. Because he supports the charge with the addition of such words as these, viz., "Provided they are things pertaining to life and godliness." Another witness confirms this statement, and I should dwell no longer on the matter, did I not feel that, laying aside altogether those who know nothing of God, and, therefore, cannot truly ask at all, there is among true believers, a great disposition to forget that the only thing which makes any thing desirable in the sight of a saint—the only thing which makes any thing worthy to be asked of God—the only thing which makes any thing worthy to come into a saint's conception, is, that it pertains to that eternal life which is in the knowledge of God,—in the doing of his will—in the demonstration of his praises. For example, when the witness qualifies Mr. C.'s teaching, as here applying only to things that pertain to life and godliness, it is evident, that he would hold it unrighteous to have salvation without Christ—it is evident, he would hold it unrighteous to have it without knowing God—it is evident, that he would hold it unrighteous to have a license for sin—it is evident, that he would hold it unrighteous to have salvation without peace and joy in the Holy Ghost—and, to sum up all, it is evident, that he would hold it awfully unrighteous, either to conceive in himself, or to ask of God *safety* without *salvation*. I make this last distinction, because it was put to one of the witnesses for the prosecution, and he did not perceive it to exist. Yet it just lies in this, that he who is saved, is saved from what God hates—he that is safe, is safe from what he himself fears—he that is saved, is to the glory of God—he that is safe, is to the comfort of himself.—A distinction which directly involves the momentous question, whether God or the creature is the end of the creature's being—whether God, who made all men to enjoy and glorify him, has redeemed them just to be safe—whether the creature shall be the

vessel of God's almighty grace—or God the obsequious servant of the creature's selfishness?

The third branch of the charge is this, "Christ's right to judge men, is that he has redeemed them." Judgment presupposes our forgiveness. It is as persons who have been forgiven, that we shall be judged." And it is the branch, on which I peculiarly desire that the Rev. Synod observe the substance of the proof—because it is the branch which peculiarly shows the condemning power and sanctifying efficacy of the doctrine taught. That God has at all times a right to judge his creatures, is undoubted. But God has seen meet to constitute the same person the channel, both of his present forgiveness and of his future judgment. It is proved abundantly that the law under which Mr. C. taught all men to be originally constituted, was no doubt the law of God—the law of the three persons in the Godhead; but was, nevertheless, made to stand in, and be exercised by the invisible Father,—that the curse of that law, was the curse of the Father, and that so it was ordered, just because, not only in time, but from all eternity, the Son was he who should become the incarnate Redeemer—and the Holy Ghost was he who should become the life-giving Spirit. That this is the case, is proved by what God has said in regard to the sacrifice of Christ, viz., that what he voluntarily, and by grace underwent, was the curse of the Father's law—that, what he was voluntarily made under, was the obligation of the Father's law. Now, Sir, God is not a man, that he should change, or that he should abate the least from his once and eternally just requirements. If it was a just thing for him to publish the law, and impose the curse, it should be a just thing in him eternally to continue the law.

Therefore, if it so be that Christ, being himself the gift of the Father's love, has not redeemed, or more literally, bought all men from the righteous curse of his Father—not that they may escape judgment, but with the real design and

intention that they may not meet it *unprepared*—not that they may cease, but that they may learn to hate sin—not that they may be easy away from God—but that they may know and enjoy him,—if this, I say, be the case, then, as to all men who are not so bought by the Son, the curse of the Father's law must be yet standing—and if it be yet standing, then it must find its execution on them. But, where in the whole Scriptures do we find that any man shall ever underlie the curse of the Father's law. I can find neither in the Scriptures, nor in the evidence before you any future curse but that of the Lamb—expressing the wrath of the Lamb—that Lamb who has taken the world's sin away from before the Father's face. Whence it is plain—not that the curse of the Father's law was taken away by violence, or appeasing interference, but that the Father himself did so love men, as to send forth his Son from his bosom to manifest in the sympathy of a heart of flesh, equally compassionate and agonized, all the tender mercies of invisible Godhead, and to demonstrate sin, in the very act of putting it away, as no longer an obstacle in coming away from it to God. So that when Satan by his lies—Eve by her folly—Adam by his facility—and all of them by their daring usurpation upon God's prerogatives, and blasphemy of his character, did bring into question the Father's law,—when they set up in the creation of God a standard of rebellion against God's will—when they held up a false testimony that God's will was not a righteous thing, *i. e.* that God himself was evil. Christ did in the fulness of time come forth to destroy these works of the Devil—not to repeal the Father's law, but to set it beyond all question—not to abolish, but to exhaust its curse: and so to prove for ever the holiness of the one, and the righteousness of the other, in a way not to be gainsayed.

Thus do we see, Sir, not that the wicked shall never come into condemnation—but that, in this day of grace, they are actually under none—being delivered from the curse of the

Father—and (thanks unto God), being not yet subjected to the curse of the Son—to whom the Father who judgeth no man hath committed all judgment—~~what is to judge~~, be it observed—not on the ground of his ~~having been~~ eternally God—but on that of his having become ~~manifested~~ at whose appearing and kingdom, (the revelation of himself) shall be revealed and operated on that righteous opinion of every man's condition, which the Father hath enabled the human heart of the Son to form at every instant of this day of grace. Rom. ii. 2, 5. John v. 36. Sir, as God, the Eternal Son, needed not to acquire authority. For, as such, he was God equal with the Father. He did not so need to purchase men in order to redeem them from iniquity, because they are all his already, by right of Godhead; but it was by becoming the Son of man—by enduring the curse of man—by glorifying God in the flesh of man—by condemning sin in the flesh through faith according to the grace of the Holy Ghost, to show its utter wickedness and inexcusableness in us, whose very condition and helplessness he took,—by putting away sin in the sacrifice of himself—bearing it in his own body on the tree—and, finally, by rising in the same body, no longer in the likeness of flesh of sin, but in glorious and eternal stability—victorious over him that had the power of death, and seated with our flesh on the Father's throne in the light of God himself—thus did he redeem all men from the curse, to the intent that they might be redeemed from iniquity, and not defeat the mind of God—that they might bow the knee to God's installed King. Thus were all brought under the glorious gospel—thus they might see the Father, in the incarnate Son, their brother—thus they live under the light of God's grace—thus they live under the blessing of his goodness—thus have they proclaimed unto them, in God's marvellous long suffering, the glad tidings of great joy—thus is the righteous judgment of the world, by God's ordained man, made matter of joy and not of woe—thus is it shown

that, if men fear and perish, it is not because God hath not commended his love—not because he has not made provision for their rejoicing in his judgment—but because they know that to kiss the Son is to depart from the iniquity which they love. It is a soul-destroying delusion, that, because no man can believe but by the Holy Ghost, and no man but an elect person does believe;—therefore, they who do not are to be merely compassionated and not also condemned as the resisters of God. Although it is manifest, from the evidence, that the work of God in Christ—a work *for* all men—is a thing to be ever distinguished from that work in the election of the Father, whereby the Holy Ghost makes them members of Christ,—yet it is never to be lost sight of for a moment that the revelation of the remission of sins in Christ is indeed a revelation of the whole person of Christ—that in the gift of Christ to man is essentially included the gift of the Holy Ghost to every man—and that the Holy Ghost, in his limited condition as the Spirit of the man Jesus, doth at once and continually witness concerning Christ to man, and concerning man to Christ. Whence it is, that Christ, to whom the Father hath committed all judgment, does nevertheless disclaim the proximate judgment of any man, and explicitly declares that the word that he hath spoken (that word which is spirit and life, and made so by the life-giving Spirit,) shall judge men at that day. In the ear of him who came not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might have life—that same Spirit whom he hath shed down continually testifieth concerning and against the men who will not receive him. Because he is ever taking of the things of Christ—in nature—in providence—in chastisement—in blessing, and in Word—and showing them unto men—because he is ever striving to enter into men and to make them habitations of God—the condition of unbelief is shown to be one of stern and continual activity in shutting out, and giving the lie to the God of all grace and truth,

in resolute refusal to yield themselves unto God—in doing despite to that Spirit with whom, and not with the Son, they are ever in immediate contact,—so that in the last day they who are the enemies of God's king, will be condemned—not because He has not redeemed them—not that God has left them no witness—not that God has revealed his character in his decree of election in a way which shows his character inadequately revealed in Christ—but that, while God, putting forth his power, prevents his elect from doing despite like the rest of the world—the world have, by unbelief, declared that God's character is a thing they hate. They have not constructively resisted God by rejecting a testimony—but have rejected a testimony—because actually resisting the Holy Ghost—who is every day and hour, by the Scriptures, by the testimony (how little living!) of the saints, by the sun, and the rain, and the fruitful seasons, by food, and gladness, by clothing, by blessings of all kinds, testifying unto them—knocking at their hearts. They have trampled under foot the Son of God—and of him whom the Father has made Lord to his glory—and ordained as his King in Zion, they have said that he is worthy to be trampled under foot, and as lightly esteemed as the mire of the streets.

Sir, I feel that there are yet one or two things with which I must conclude my observations on this charge. Of these the first is, the very important distinction taken through the whole of this evidence between the love of God directed to all men, desiring to bless them, and the approbation of God directed to his own image in the saints—who are thus blessed in the knowledge of him.

The very fact that God is so earnestly desiring to bless man in the knowledge of himself, is the proof that men are in a state which God does not approve, but utterly abhors, and that God can never be well pleased in contemplating any man, unless he sees him delivered out of that state, and filled with the mind of the well-beloved one, in whom he was well

pleased. And not less clearly does the evidence exhibit that most vital distinction between God's will, that every man should be saved, and God's purpose that the elect fore-ordained in the Son shall not reject the testimony alike delivered to all—the one, that exhibition of God's mind and desire which men do continually contradict and contravene by sin—the other, that exhibition of his resolution, that the unbelief of the world shall not make his faith of none effect—and that though the great mass of mankind should inexcusably abide in darkness, preferring the works thereof, he himself will, by his own mighty power, constitute in his elect people an indefeasible exception, to the glory of his grace. I do feel that the possibility of God's will being defeated—or, in other words, the reality of the great issue between God and men, whether they will, or will not, come to him as a fountain of life, manifested to all in Christ Jesus—is a thing not more distinct from his secret purpose of election, than it is generally overlooked, and yet vastly important, as the hinge on which turn the whole responsibility of man, and the whole clearness of God's judgment. If God's will is merely that whereby he purposes that his elect children shall come unto him through time, then it is plain that, although his election are personally revealed, his will is not a revelation at all. And it is equally manifest that he cannot, as the honest God, be desiring any others than the elect to enjoy the blessedness of Christ. Therefore he cannot be honestly telling any others than the elect that he is desiring them to enjoy that blessedness. And if he cannot be telling this to any others, how can his ministers, who dare only speak according to his will, do more than he? If his ministers do speak to men of any more extensive desire as in the mind of God (as certainly they daily do) they are not speaking from him. Their message ought to be no object of faith, no moral appeal, grounded upon a work for all, but the mere declaration of a secret purpose. And if it be more, assuredly they would be most



presumptuously exceeding their warrant, in saying something concerning their master, which he cannot own. It may be philosophy—it may be rational according to fallen reason's handmaidenship to the devil—but certainly it is not of faith—certainly it contradicts the whole history of the world in the oracles of truth, thus to extirpate the whole character of God, by freezing, (not his purposes, which must stand), but his revealed will into an unalterable fate. Why, Sir, if it be so, either man never fell—or God made him fall. Either all the antediluvians rested on the promised seed—or God willed that this promise should be treated as none—and he himself made a liar. Was not his will defeated by the Jews, whom all he called out of Egypt—to whom all he promised the land—but on many of whom, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, he made known his breach of promise—because they would not trust him when called by his promise to do so? Heb. iii. 16., iv. 1., Numb. xiv. 34. Did they not defeat his will with whom he deposited his oracles—when, through his word not abiding in them, they, with wicked hands, slew Messiah, the Prince of life—the heir of David? Was not Christ's will defeated when he wept over Jerusalem? Was not the Holy Ghost's will defeated, when he would no longer strive with the men before the flood, (Gen. vi. 3,)—when the Jews provoked him in the wilderness, (Heb. iii. 7,) and when Stephen said of them that they resisted the Holy Ghost? Acts vii. 51. It is an awful but a vital truth of God, that we worms of the dust have the power of contradicting the desire of him that made and upholds us. It is this that makes the gospel the evolution not of a dead scheme—not of a thing to be merely looked at as a wonderful contrivance—but of a living appliance, and transaction, and responsibility,—a taking account how man will deal with God.

Now, Sir, I come to the second charge, which, in as far as found relevant, is this, “that he alone bore the character of peace-maker, who knew that Christ died for every human

being." And again, in speaking of the love of God, you said that that love, to every individual of Adam's family, was equal or according to the agonies of the Son of God. I have stated, Sir, in the reasons of appeal, that the appellant does not, in the least, disown the second part of this charge, provided it be understood that the words, "equal, or according to the agonies of the Son of God," be held synonymous with those which appear in the evidence of almost every witness who speaks to this charge, that these agonies were the measure, proof, expression, or commendation, Rom. v. 8, of the love of God to every individual of Adam's family; in short, that the death of Christ, which consummated all his agonized humiliation, was not the procurer of God's love to believers, but the fruit of his eternal love to all, and so intended to lead all to repentance. In regard to the first part of this second charge, I would remark, that at p. 34, E. you have Mr. Bain stating what Mr. Campbell defined peace-makers to be, namely, "those who, like Christ, reconcile men to God." Now, if peace-makers be, according to this evidence, the men who, like Christ, reconcile men to God, it is quite plain that they must speak of God, by the spirit of Christ, as Christ spoke of God—that they must tell, by word and work, in short, by their whole being, what their God was telling them, when he was revealed in Christ, in the words, in the acts, in the beneficence, in the whole person of Christ—in the whole workings of a man's sympathetic heart—they must tell the blessedness of dwelling in and knowing God, as the man Christ always dwelt in and knew the Father—they must tell men to taste and see that the Lord is gracious, and that he who gave to his Christ the sure mercies of David, never puts to shame any who trust in him. They must speak of what they know, and testify what they have seen, of the God of peace. They must owe no man any thing but love, as Christ did before them. They must make peace, sowing in peace the fruits of righteousness.

James iii. 18. They must cry out unto all to be reconciled, because they feel so themselves. Mr. Campbell taught, then, that a peace-maker is one who calls on men to be reconciled to God, because such a one knows that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and knows the fact, and tastes the blessedness of being himself reconciled to God. And, therefore, while my client does not positively deny the words of this branch of the charge, he, at the same time, maintains, that the evidence in the case truly rests and founds the character of a peace-maker, not on the knowledge of a universal fact, however true and glorious, but on the personal certainty that God has loved the man himself, and a personal tasting of the Lord's goodness, in the revelation of Christ Jesus. For, be it observed, that the character of a peace-maker, and the qualification to be a peace-maker, are somewhat different things—the former implying that condition in which I feel the peace of God,—the latter implying, in addition, the knowledge that God has, in the death of Christ for them, revealed his peace to them—the ability to tell them of a peace, their enjoyment of which will be most honouring, and not like the peace of the world, most dishonouring to God. The former may be illustrated by reference to p. 32, C, which states, that a man “cannot declare the love of God, unless he knows from experience that God loves him;” to 91, C, “that he alone had the *character* of peace-maker, who believed the love of God to himself *personally* ;” and then to 104, A, where the witness, being interrogated whether, in the sermon preached before the Presbytery, Mr. Campbell spoke of it being essential to the *character* of a peace-maker, that a man should know that Christ died for every human being? Depones, that he does not think that Mr. Campbell made that statement, or any thing to that effect; and, lastly, to 48, B, where another witness depones, “that he said that those men were peace-makers who were reconciled unto God”—showing this, that while Mr. Camp-

bell undoubtedly taught that it was a right thing for a regenerate person to know that Christ had died for all men; still he rested the character of a peace-maker, not upon the knowledge of that fact, but upon that which none but a child of God can understand, viz. the *consciousness* of a man's own heart, testifying to him that this is eternal life—to know God.

The next charge which regards the extent of the atonement is the 9th; viz. That every man is in this state, that while he has in him death in Adam, he has life given him *by* Christ—that the blessing of life *in* Christ is co-extensive with the curse, and belongs to all upon whom the curse has passed." The remainder has been found irrelevant. I have stated in the reasons of protest and appeal, that my Rev. client fully admits the 2d branch of this charge under the very important explanation therein given in regard to the 1st branch—an explanation borne out by the uniform testimony of all the witnesses—an explanation of much vaster moment than at first sight appears. It may seem a *very* critical thing to make a distinction between the use of the word *by* and the use of the word *in*; but from believing that it is any thing but an idle criticism, I have been induced to state, that Mr. C. does not admit this part of the charge as laid—first, because he never taught, and trust never to teach so—second, because the whole of the evidence shows that he taught something quite the opposite. Sir, he taught that all men were in possession of death by nature,—that as it was life to know God, it was death not to know him;—and, that, as eternal life, to be judicially sealed in the kingdom to come, is not a separate acquisition apart from, and over and above the life that now is, but just its fulfilment and judicial manifestation; so the second death is the fulfilment and judicial manifestation of the death that now is, that is—*as saith the word of the righteous Judge at his appearing, he that is filthy, let him be filthy still, he that is holy let him*

be holy still—the children of light shall see light, those of darkness, darkness—they that bear fruit to God shall not cease from bearing fruit—they that hide themselves from the Lord shall be clothed with shame and punished with destruction from his presence—they that rejoice to serve him shall have liberty to serve—they that seek his face shall see it for ever. Such being all men's inheritance by nature, he taught that they have all a gift of life—which does not mean that they are all in the possession of life, (for that cannot be unless they all love God) but that there is given to all by the Father that gift of God—God's unspeakable gift, the Lord Jesus Christ—in whom is all fulness of life—fulness of grace from—fulness of love to the Father who gave him life—the Father whom to know in the life of the Son is itself eternal life.—It is impossible to take life *out of* Christ—for he hath received it to have it *in* himself. But he is given to all—and all, sinners as they are, are welcome to enter—that, tasting life, they may cease from sin. Are you or are you not in Christ? is the test of life or death. To suppose life out of Christ is to suppose God out of Christ—And, therefore to teach (except by a mistake in phraseology) that all men have life given them *by* Christ, would be to tell men of a gift in which God gave away his very character as God. Now, Sir, if you will look at the evidence regarding the sermon in question, at p. 34 A, you find Mr. C. saying that “every man is in this condition, that while he has in him death in Adam, he has life given him in Christ. And while at p. 42 E, it is deponed that on that occasion ‘Mr. C. said “they who admit that Christ died for all, but that there is some distance between men and the benefits resulting from his death, are commending something that is not the gospel;” and while it is manifest that they who do suppose any such distance, do not truly understand the completeness of the *gift of God*—and the awful responsibility so thrown upon man in not receiving it, still the testimony

at p. 133 G, "that all men had an accursed life in or through Adam, and that in like manner all men had a life *given to them in Christ*," does in conjunction with that previously quoted, and with others that I need not quote, state so clearly the true relation of the body to the head—as distinct from that of the head to all men, that I shall add nothing to it.

Then, Sir, having already exhausted the 10th charge, in considering the first, I proceed to consider those three charges that refer to the doctrine of assurance, viz. the fourth, which regards the assurance of faith; the eighth, which regards the assurance of salvation; and the sixth, which regards the assurance of salvation in connexion with the participation of the Lord's supper. In considering the first of these subjects we must, at the outset, inquire what Mr. C. taught the assurance of faith to be. At p. 3. F, it is called "an assurance of the truth of the record,—as undoubted an assurance as one human being could have of the presence of another human being." At p. 88, E, "the assurance of God's love to the individual believer." And at p. 101, C, the witness states "that faith must have an object, and that assurance of faith is neither more nor less than a believing the existence of the thing." By these three testimonies the assurance of faith is made just the belief of the record of God's love—manifested in the person and work of Christ to me; for the record of God concerns his Son. The Son himself is the living object held forth to all men for the exercise, not of a historical credence, but of a living faith and hope. He, therefore, is the object of the assurance of faith, for it rests on the glorious gospel or glad tidings of Christ, who is the *image* of God—on that word—which is not a letter, but instinct with life—on the declaration of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life. In short, the assurance of faith is to see, with unsealed eyes, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Father's unveiled face, to know him by the Holy Ghost as my Saviour, whom the Father has sent to bless me in turn-

ing me from my iniquities. That is Mr. C.'s meaning when speaking of the assurance of faith. The evidence shows, in various places and ways, that a mere credence of the testimony—a belief of the love of God merely—a belief of the mere existence of an object—is not the assurance of faith which Mr. C. spoke of. Because the testimony must be felt to be God's—the love must be felt to be a love which not only does not overlook, but preeminently declares the exceeding sinfulness of sin—the object must be the express image of God—and no forms of theology—He who is to crucify and not to amend or exercise the flesh—he who is not to cover our unrighteousness but to disgrace it, and work *in* us the righteousness of the law—he who hath redeemed us that he may search us with lamps of fire—and judge not by a fiction—but in righteousness. And one cannot easily conceive a more destructive device of Satan than that by which he has contrived to persuade men—that there is any thing honouring to God, or beneficial to man, left behind at all, when you take assurance concerning God, away from faith in God. Faith is faith only when it is an assurance—and that which faith is must be of its essence—and necessary to salvation, if faith be so. This saith the Spirit in all the Scriptures, and well says the old Confession, that “the wicked and the devil are cunning in the history.” Let us therefore fear.

But, Sir, while Mr. C. taught that this assurance of faith was of the essence of faith, he did not teach that assurance of salvation was of the essence of faith; and, I beg, therefore, with all deference, but most positively, to contradict what fell from a Rev. Dr. last night on that matter—for nowhere in the proof will you find any thing of the kind; and, indeed, such an idea is extravagant, inasmuch as it either denies that God is the sole object of faith—or declares that looking at myself is essential to looking at God. And, it is no less necessary to remark, that while Mr. C. taught assur-

ance to be of the essence of faith, he did never teach that it must necessarily be *always* in operation, or, in other words, that inconstant faith was none at all. He certainly always taught that it *should* never cease its operation, inasmuch as they who know God ought to be always beholding His glory, and do grievously sin in turning away ; but he did not teach more, and, if he did, his own conscience would deny that it was always so—for that would be to teach not that a Christian ought never, (which is right, and now too much forgotten,) but that he could never be in a state of unbelief. On the contrary, he appears to have continually taught that, just in proportion as our faith is strong, or weak, or absent, so also is our assurance of faith, which is the essence of our faith, as distinct from the faith of devils.

Accordingly, in his answers on this subject, p. 48, he says, “ Whilst I hold assurance to be of the essence of faith, I do not hold that the converted person is necessarily always in a condition of assurance, as to his being in a state of salvation, *inasmuch as I do not hold it to be impossible for a converted person to be at times so overcome of the temptation of Satan, causing darkness through the flesh, as it may be to stand in doubt of the first principles of the oracles of God ;* and, it is manifest, that if brought into such darkness, and such unbelief, there must be the interruption of the blessed consciousness of being a child of God and an heir of glory.” And, it is remarkable that one of the witnesses gives the truth of the oracles of God, as one of the matters in which Mr. C. taught that a Christian man might, at times, be unbelieving. For, he says, “ that a Christian might fall into such darkness, as to doubt whether the Bible was the word of God, p. 64, F, although then he did not exhibit a Christian character.” In agreement with this, we find Mr. C. at p. 41, A, teaching “ that there might be different degrees of faith, or that faith might be impaired.” And at p. 149, D, that a regenerate man might be often tempted to doubt God’s love to him—but that it is his



sin to yield to the temptation, p. 61, F. This, many understand as a mere misfortune—and so, giving place to the Devil, grievously dishonour God's character, as the object of trust to every man. Nor can I help adverting to what immediately follows the last quotation—the evidence, in reference to a point on which my client has been most completely misrepresented, viz., the question what it is that constitutes a Christian. I cannot well imagine a definition at once more concise and more full of divine life—that one given elsewhere in the proof—that a Christian was one who enjoyed God. But here, p. 149, E, the witness being interrogated whether Mr. C. taught that a Christian was one who believes the love of God to himself, or that he was one that understood the doctrine of God's love to the world? Depones and answers, One ~~who~~ believes God's love to himself. Now, inasmuch as many persons have asked whether Mr. C. teaches that no man is a Christian but one who believes the love of God to all the world, we have here and in various other parts of this evidence, the answer, at once satisfactory and searching, that the true test of a man's Christianity lies in the question Whether the love of God be, or be not abiding in *him*. An assurance without life, is what my client has always condemned—well knowing true assurance to be in such circumstances impossible—and, therefore, as at p. 61, F, his statements regarding it were always guarded with “while abiding in the faith.” I might go through a variety of other passages which I have noted here, in order further to illustrate his teaching; but I believe I may conclude my observations on this subject with just one passage more, at p. 162, G, where Mr. C. is seen to have taught, that what was to give a believer confidence in God was that he was forgiven and that he had received the Holy Spirit to witness that his sins were forgiven; that a believer, by having that confidence, walked in newness of life, and hated more and more the sin which he formerly loved; that through the weakness of the flesh, and the suggestions of

the Devil, a believer might, at times, lose the light of God's reconciled countenance, and walk in darkness, until these clouds were removed ; *but that that was a wrong state*, and that a believer was sure of his salvation, if he kept the beginning of his confidence sure, and always persevered in the Christian life : " whence it evidently appears, that God's revelation of himself in Christ, to redeem us from the captivity of the Devil's will, into the sweet obedience of his own, is, to every one of us, a personal thing—a personal appeal—which, if we put away, we shall be judged God's despisers ; and that there can be no faith in the Son whom God has sent, unless it persuades me that the Son is indeed sent to turn *me* from *mine* iniquities. That is the assurance which is of the essence of faith, which languishes and revives with faith, and which is never, no never to be recovered by looking at the face of man, or the interior of our dark hearts, or at what we have been in times past, but by looking unto God *now*, in the face of Jesus Christ.

Before quitting this charge, I feel myself further called to add, that, besides the very general idea, that Mr. Campbell made the Christian character to consist in believing God's love to the world, instead of making it consist in personally receiving God's love to myself, there is another great and kindred misrepresentation, which also stands strikingly contradicted by the evidence in this cause. What Mr. Campbell really taught was, that men would come into condemnation through unbelief ; that no man would be punished as under the curse of the Father's law ; but that all who knew not Christ were, at every instant, heaping up, by a continued condition of unbelief and spiritual death, wrath in the day of wrath, and the *revelation* of God's righteous judgment upon the vital question, whether their *true* condition be in furtherance or in spite of God's grace ; that unbelief was the condition in which, as long as a man abode, he could not be working righteousness, being not a temple, or a vessel, but

a resister of the Holy Ghost; that the reason of a man's not being holy was his unbelief—the reason of his unbelief was his fall from, and enmity against God; and, in short, that not being in Christ was the true thing for which a man would be condemned. Now, this glorious doctrine is liable, and has been exposed to two gross mistakes, both of which may be rectified by attention to the proof. The one is the mistake of thinking that men will not be condemned for their deeds. Now, the whole proof shows, that every deed, good and bad, shall be brought up into judgment—the good to be manifest as God's, to his praise—the evil to be manifest as of the Devil—that ungodly men shall be truly judged for their ungodly deeds, lying, backbiting, and all other works of the flesh; but that these deeds will be judged, not because the curse which Christ bore and did away, is to be revived against them, but because, being the entire works of the man, they shall be proofs that the man has not had, in any degree, the mind of God—that the man has not been thinking the thoughts—entertaining the desires of God—that the man has not been at all led by the Spirit of God—that there is in him nothing, however little, of the incorruptible seed. The other error is, that of imagining that the coming and personal condemnation is made to rest on the rejection, not of God's love to the person, but of his love to the world. But nothing is more evident, from this proof, than, that if God sent his Son to bless each man, in turning each man from his iniquity, then each man is not believing, unless he believe that Christ was so sent for *him*, and he is not rejecting Christ unless rejecting the record that Christ was sent to turn *him* from his iniquities. The love of God seeks an end—has an object. He that keepeth Christ's word—he that hath boldness in the day of judgment—in him is God's love perfected—that is, in him is it not defeated of its proper end—the holiness and hope of the creature. 1 John, ii. 5; iv. 17. But he that keepeth not the words—

and hath not the boldness, turns upside down God's gracious intention, and fatherly yearning. Christ will speedily come again, invested with the glory, commissioned by the mandate of the Father—having all this while held in his human heart the righteous opinion of God, as well as the sympathy of man—he will come to take account, to take searching cognisance publicly—to ask the question, who have fulfilled, and who have frustrated the grace of the living God; to manifest his now righteous judgment—to give to all things, and all persons that which his eyes of fire see to be truly and without any fiction their due; to let every man reap eternal life or corruption as to the flesh or to the Spirit he may have sown. For while the Father is in this day of grace dealing with all men in the name of the incarnate Son—at the day of the Son of man damnation shall not linger; there shall be no second mediator between the mediator and men; the Holy Spirit shall testify against them who have done him despite; every thing of the old man, whether in the friends or enemies of Christ, shall be utterly destroyed—the new man alone—the Holy Ghost's golden workmanship, shall stand the fire; and every person in the universe shall stand or fall *as he truly is*. Accordingly, at p. 80, A, the witness understands Mr. C. to have taught that unbelievers “will be judged not according to the law, but the gospel—that they will be condemned for having despised a goodness which *should* have led them to repentance.” Then at p. 92, E, the evidence bears, “that unbelievers will be condemned in the day of judgment because of not believing the love of God to themselves.” And lastly, at p. 125, A, the witness being interrogated whether, when Mr. C. spoke of the condemnation of any individual at the last day, he ascribed that condemnation to his rejection of God's love to himself, or to his not understanding the love of God to the world: Depone and answers, “to the rejection of God's love to his own soul.” Before I pass to the next charge, I would just ob-

serve in reference to that at present before you, that my client in the reasons of appeal, admits it as proved in substance with one indispensable qualification, namely "that although the personal knowledge of God's mercy and forgiveness be essential to a Christian character and conversation—its constancy is not essential to regeneration." Now, while the 4th charge makes assurance of God's love essential to Christian character—it does not make it essential to the existence of regeneration. And, you will observe, that the whole evidence bears out this distinction. For Mr. Strong, whose evidence may be taken as in this representing most of the rest, states, that Mr. C. always admitted the possibility of losing this assurance, yet as constantly maintained the inconsistency of such a loss with a Christian character. Now, Sir, I come to the 8th charge (passing, for the present, the 6th, which is only a particular modification of it). And what is it? "That none could receive and rest upon Christ for salvation, who had not an assurance of their own salvation." Certainly this is one of the strangest of all these strange charges—for if we are to understand it as it reads, it makes the assurance of salvation, that is, the assurance of being blessed, in being turned from iniquity to precede, (see pp. 88, F; 119, A; 127, B;) and even to form the warrant for, our receiving and resting on Christ. Mr. C. freely admits that assurance of faith is essential to our resting—because it actually is resting on Christ. But, certainly, not even of the assurance of faith—and still less of the assurance of salvation; can it be heard for a moment that it precedes, or is the warrant for resting on Christ. And it is remarkable that the only witness for the prosecution as to this charge, does not give it in these words at all. For, at at p. 42, B, he Depones, "that Mr. C.'s explanation was, that no one *can have received, or be resting* upon Christ for salvation, unless he had personal assurance of his own salvation." This, with the previous explanations about interruption of faith, is what Mr. C. really teaches, and directly

admits in his answers, pp. 49, 51, &c. But I confess, I was rather surprised by Dr. Hamilton's enumerating among the acts of true faith, the receiving and resting upon Christ, and yet denying that assurance of salvation springs from faith—because, Sir, if faith be the receiving and resting upon Christ, then, it is quite plain, that in merely believing any proposition whatever, I am not resting upon Christ; in short, that I am not resting upon Christ, unless I have the assurance of faith—unless by the Holy Spirit, I understand in my conscience to whom it is that the proposition refers. For, it is one thing to rest on an act of one's own mind, and a totally different thing to rest on him who is the only rest for wearied souls. And, if so,—then, to say that a man who is receiving and resting on the Lord Jesus Christ, has not the assurance of salvation, in so far as he is resting on him—is just to state one or other of two monstrous propositions, either that in God's sight a man is resting on Christ, who is not doing it with his mind or his conscience, or reposing upon him at all; or else that Christ, if one on whom a man may rest without assurance of salvation while so resting—is a rock unworthy to be built upon—as unsecure as the things whereof the fashion passeth away. I say it, without any qualification, that between these two conclusions there is no alternative. And, therefore, abhorring both, I repeat, that while a man is resting on Christ, he knows, and is assured that he on whom he rests, hath burst the gates of brass—hath condemned sin in the flesh—hath led captivity captive—and is to him and every pilgrim, a tried corner stone—a sure door of hope. But I believe that such an idea as the above, arises from forgetting for the time what salvation is. Let us, therefore, see what the evidence declares it to be. At p. 104, G, Mr. C. is represented as having taught, “that the religion of God is not a selfish religion, but consists in living to the glory of God.” Now, Sir, there are few who are not seeking any salvation at all—but there are yet fewer who are either

seeking or finding (for he that seeketh findeth) the salvation of *God*—who are seeking the glory of God. Their own comfort, and their own glory, are the idols of multitudes; and we shall most unwisely judge, if we suppose that a religious profession, however long, varied, or secure, can slay these idols. At p. 149, C, salvation is defined deliverance from sin; at p. 85, E, deliverance from enmity to God; at p. 126, E. “as to the present, the healing of the soul by its being brought from a state of sin, into a state of peace with God—and as to the future, eternal happiness in the *presence of God*.” But that he that is saved, has God’s mind, and must needs declare it; and, as God condemns sin, delights to depart from it, and condemn it, no more to commit or to witness it. This is salvation—not a thing to be hoped for, independent of, or as distinct from, although somehow depending on our moral condition. It is in its perfection, the completion of a character, which, from regeneration onward is salvation—a thirsting for God, as a Holy God—a longing for the new heavens and new earth, which the righteousness of God shall fill—for the face of Jesus—the image of the righteous God. Therefore, assurance of salvation is just being assured that I am in that blessed condition, in reference to God, and that such blessedness shall be full at the Lord’s appearing. *It requires no demonstration. It is an act of consciousness.* A man who is living his natural life does not require to be told that he is alive. He does not require to infer his existence from all the motions of his tongue, or of his hands—or of his mind. And, if so of the natural life, how much more of the spiritual life. When I am trusting, enjoying, seeking, beholding, and declaring God, I know that I am doing so, and this is salvation; therefore, the assurance of salvation is just an act of consciousness, that I am, to a greater or less degree, (alas how little!), in the condition which God desired me and all to be in, when he sent his Son to save us. And the reason why there are so many going about to obtain,

by a thousand devices, some ground of confidence concerning themselves—especially by looking into themselves, in whom dwelleth no good thing, is just, I fear, because there are so many who seem to be, but are not, alive to God—who think that because they have thoughts about God, they cannot but be glorifying him—though they know it not—and who, of course, cannot understand the meaning of a consciousness which they do not possess. There can be no such assurance of our condition without the exercise of faith *at the time*. It is not by having once believed, that I am sanctified. Neither is it by reflecting that I once believed that I can be truly assured of my state—for it is an assurance of life—and without faith life cannot be—and faith is not a transaction done once for all—but the condition of the regeneration of God—who ever giveth liberally,—drawing water of life from the exhaustless and ever-welling fountain of a liberal Father. If men do not love God—if men do not hate sin—if men do not rejoice in God, and are not seeking his will, it is clear they never can be conscious of such things. The root of it all is, that they imagine salvation without God, and know not, that while the assurance of faith is a resting on my God—the assurance of salvation is just a conscious existence to God's glory. Sir, it is no critical distinction to make between the assurance of faith and the assurance of salvation, that the one is, and the other is not of the essence of faith. If assurance of salvation were of the essence of faith the consciousness that I am alive to God would be of the essence of that very thing by which I become alive to God. The consciousness of life must follow its constitution. And, accordingly, if you look at p. 88, the witness “being interrogated what Mr. C. expressed by the assurance of salvation: Depones and answers, the consciousness of being individually in a state of reconciliation and peace with God;” which just expresses, not the grovelling consideration that God is not angry with me, but a living harmony between my will and



the will of God; and the evidence adds, "that it was impossible for a man to have the assurance of God's love to himself individually, without the consciousness of being in a state of salvation;" because it is the believer only that delights to serve the Lord—the believer only that delights to look at the face of the Lord—the believer only that can look *with* God on the things that are, laying a sure hold on eternal life, wherein his servants shall ever serve him, and never cease to see his face—the believer only, who, through life obtained, understandeth the true death of sin, the true life of God—the believer only who has nothing in himself whereof to glory, because he glorieth in the Lord, and saith, in a *true* heart, *I am* alive to God—I doubt it not—yet not I, but Christ, which liveth in me—the workmanship—the temple of the Holy Ghost to the Father's praise.

And it is not the least glorious feature of this proof that it so continually represents the acting of faith—the truth of God—the living dependence of the creature upon him who, being crucified in weakness, has been raised in power,—as the only sustainer of, and the indispensable requisite to, the comfortable assurance of the creature, the more especially as one chief work of the Devil in false religion, is to persuade men into some seemingly godly method of dispensing with a true and unfeigned trust at the time, without the loss of selfish comfort concerning their condition. For nothing can be more manifest—nothing more needful to the vindication of God's character as the only object of trust—than that the moment I cease to look at the love of God in the face of Christ, at that moment I *must*, because at that moment I ought, to lose my acquaintance with the fact that I am saved or alive to God, who ever saith, "Look unto *me* and be saved." At p. 127, C, "Mr. C. taught that no man can be born of God, and receive that life, without being aware of it—yet that Satan, and the world, and the flesh, may so overcome him at times, *as that he shall lose sight of the love of God to him*, and be in dark-

ness—yet, that it is true that God does love him, and has forgiven him, and that as the *elect* of God he cannot perish ; but being born of God, has and will inherit eternal life—that a regenerate person, when in such darkness, is not entitled to take any comfort to his soul, from considering that he *once* knew and had peace with God, and that he was an elect person,—because he can only have assurance of salvation through a *present* life,—according to the language of St. Paul, “ The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved *me*, and gave himself for *me* ;” and “ that it was more particularly sinful for a believer, having once tasted that the Lord was gracious, thus to forsake his first love.” For God has made provision for continual trust and peace and joy in them that know his name, as truly as he has provided for the knowledge of that name in all. And what can be a more monstrous dishonour to the fulness of Christ, than to say that the contemplation of a man’s former condition at any given time is more effectual or proper to give him peace now than the present sight of God’s face in Christ—that sight which he may always have—that sight by which first he obtained peace in believing.

“ The connexion,” says a witness at p. 136, A, “ taught by Mr. Campbell, to exist between the assurance of faith and the assurance of future salvation, was this, that while a regenerate man was in the state of having an assured faith, he would also have at the same time the assurance of future salvation ; and that the principle on which this connexion rested, was, that the man who assuredly believed what God had revealed of himself, knew that which made him confidently depend on God for salvation,—according to that word, they that know thy name will put their trust in thee ; but Mr. C. did not teach that while a man had not the assurance of his future salvation, he was *necessarily* a child of the Devil, or an unbeliever ; yet that he, of whom that was true *at all times*, was an unbeliever.”

I think I have now only the sixth charge to speak of. The charge is, that in July, 1830, Mr. C., in fencing the tables, debarred from the Lord's Supper all who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation." Now, Sir, upon this I observe, in the first place, that there is not here, as in the other charges, any latitude allowed as to the mode of expression. It is not said, "or words to the like effect," therefore, unless the libellers prove the words, they prove nothing. 2d, It was a thing transacted at the fencing of the tables, not at any time preparatory or subsequent to the Sacrament, but at the time of that service known in our Church under that particular title. 3d, It was a *debarring*—by which I certainly understand something much more than that spiritual instruction in any matter of faith which a minister, in the ordinary course of teaching, gives to his people. His people are, no doubt, bound to esteem him highly in love for his works' sake; and, with discernment between flesh and spirit, to receive, in the obedience of faith, not as from the man at all, but as from the minister of Christ, whatsoever he ministers out to them from the treasure-house in the way of spiritual instruction. But there is a higher function yet which he is to exercise: that is, not merely to speak to his people concerning Christ in the wisdom of the Spirit, but to exercise the authority of Christ over his people; and I certainly understand this *debarring* to be not spiritual instruction or counsel merely, but spiritual authority; although that the spiritual authority stands not in the employment of the word "*debar*," or in any other form of speech. Unless these three particulars concur, the charge remains unproved. Now, it is a very remarkable thing, that, while there are a number of witnesses, some for the prosecution, and many more against it, who speak generally as to the dispensation of the Sacrament, there is only one witness for the prosecution, who speaks to the fencing of the tables. That witness, p. 45, G, depones that he "heard Mr. C. fence the tables—that he was struck with what Mr.

C. said in regard to assurance of salvation—that about the close of Mr. C.'s address, he said that the feast was spread for the worthy communicants ; and then he added, that those who had the full assurance, were the worthy communicants, and that those who had not such assurance, would have an awful responsibility if they partook of ~~the~~ ordinance, and he left their blood upon their own head." You will immediately see how totally this only witness is contradicted by many for the defence, even supposing his single testimony to be available. But what does he really say ? We know that leaving blood on a man's own head is a phrase of very various acceptation, and I shall show that what the witness chooses so to designate did not refer to eternal condemnation, but to God's fatherly chastisement of his regenerate children, for unworthy participation. In the next place, the witness does not use the word debar at all—the only word allowed by the charge. But what effect did this novel and striking statement produce on the witness, or upon his conduct ? Look at p. 47, F, " Being interrogated whether Mr. C. gave any particular instructions to his elders as to the distribution of tokens ? Depones, that he never heard of a minister doing so when persons produced proper certificates, and that Mr. C. did not do on this occasion, as far as the deponent understood : Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. C. ever expressing to the deponent any doubt of the fitness of any particular individual to be a communicant : Depones, that the deponent's understanding of Mr. C.'s doctrine about assurance did not make him hesitate about giving tokens to any particular individual, but he does not recollect whether, after hearing that doctrine, he gave any tokens, *although he would not have refused them if they had been asked.*" This certainly looks as unlike the feelings or conduct of one who had been much startled by heresy, as can well be imagined.

Let us now look at the testimony for the defence, directly

bearing on the fencing of the tables. First, at p. 60, A, the witness explains *damnation* ~~mean~~ (what the Greek word imports) not condemnation, but chastisement; and proceeds to say, that he heard nothing like debarring, except the warning of believers against eating and drinking without the exercise of faith at the time.

Now, at the very outset, this testimony wholly confounds the statement of the libellers. For, while in one part of the libel they maintain Mr. C. to have taught, that no man was a believer unless he had a personal assurance of his own salvation, and in another part charge him with debarring all who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation. This witness says, that Mr. C. at that time treated of the way in which not unbelievers, but *believers*, might eat judgment to themselves, and he had good cause to know, because, while he gives a very accurate and explicit testimony, he states in particular that he watched narrowly, from having heard Mr. C. accused of debarring. Next, at p. 101, G, we have it expressly deponed, that although another witness had but an indistinct recollection of what Mr. C. said in fencing the tables, he "thinks he would have noticed, had Mr. C. debarred any one—because, a few days before, deponent had a conversation with Mr. C. on the subject, in which Mr. C. stated, that it was *not* the duty of a minister to *debar any one*, but to state the mind of God in reference to the institution, and to let every man approach or stay away, bearing his own responsibility;" which latter words materially explain the meaning of the witness for the prosecution, in regard to the responsibility of communicants. (See p. 103, A.) But what was the test which Mr. C. did employ in fencing the tables, not to determine whether unbelievers might communicate or not, (for none such may)—not to discover whether one was a believer or not—but whether a regenerate man, who alone might approach, was, at the time, in a fit condition to communicate? At p. 150, G, it is the discernment of the

Lord's body; and, at p. 140, E, the readiness to commemorate the love of God as a love to ~~the~~ <sup>our</sup> self, (see also p. 76, E,) in other words a reception of Christ as the gift of God's love. In the first place, then, there was no debarring. In the second, the test given was not the assurance of salvation, which regards a man's self, but ~~the~~ assurance of faith, which regards God's grace. And this you will find to correspond exactly with the terms of Mr. C.'s Answers, p. 67, where he makes the perception of God's love in the gift of Christ the only thing which can render the participation of the Lord's Supper communion at all.

For think, Sir, what is the bread and the wine?—It is, to unbelief, just bread and wine—it is, to faith, the body and blood of Christ. What is its gift? It is a sign and seal of the gift of the Lord Jesus, as the sacrifice for my sin individually, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, as the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. We must not regard the bread and the wine as merely commemorating Christ, but as having Christ in them; not in fact,—as the Papists would have it—but unto faith, in the spiritual perception of a man who is alive unto God, who knows that God loveth him, who sees that love in the incarnate Word, and that Word in the elements; who eats and drinks as one with Christ—in short, who, in his own measure, as a member, *is* the body and the blood. Therefore, when the minister gives the bread and the wine, he gives unto faith the body and ~~the~~ blood. And this he does, not in his own name, for he has no such authority of himself, but strictly as a minister—ministering that bread which came down from Heaven to be the life of the world—and commissioned by God himself to stand before the people in His stead, who gave up his only begotten Son to the death. This, Sir, is the gift of the Lord Jesus Christ, set forth, not by a mere form of words, as in the Scriptures of truth, but in a great compassionate act, and visible transaction. So he

that receiveth the bread and wine in faith, doth transact an outward and manifest reception of, and resting on the Lord Jesus, as he that doth it not in faith is guilty of pretending so to rest on him. And how can all this be, without assurance of faith—without the knowledge that Christ crucified is, *to me*, a revelation of *my* Father's heart to *me*? How can I rest on that which I know not as a resting-place for *me*? When the minister tells the people, one and all of them,—this body was broken—this blood shed for *you*, and tenders it to each on no ground but this, as applicable to each—how can any one take his place at the table, without professing, or truly partake there without truly feeling; “Yea, thanks be to God, for me.” To teach otherwise were just to enact over again, in another form, the practices of the Papacy. Satan's object, in every such delusion, is to make men content without faith. Now, the Papists see that the elements are seals, and not mere memorials; but they make men see Christ by *transubstantiation instead of faith*—and, were it a heresy to declare appropriating faith indispensable to communion, it would just be a declaration that it was unnecessary to see Christ in the Supper at all, and that a meditation about Christianity would do as well. When I am to receive the elements which represent a gift from God, the thing called for is, not that I should feel myself alive, but that I should know the gift, and in it the giver. Surely it were good to warn the saints against coming to sup with the Lord, with a lie in their mouths. And, while an unbelieving friend and an unbelieving enemy of God may be both of them not in a condition to approach the table, his is surely the greater sin (if they do so,) who has tasted the unspeakable goodness, and received the universal gift of God—yet has so disesteemed it as then to forget it. I might very well leave this charge where it stands, because there never was one so totally without foundation, being supported by none but a single and entirely contradicted witness. But the evidence

adduced, in reference to the action sermon and that which preceded it, places the matter, if possible, in a clearer light. At p. 105, A, it appears that, although in coming to the table of the Lord, "a man must know that the body, of which the bread is the symbol, has been broken for *him*; and that the blood, of which the wine is the symbol, has been shed for *him*,"—still, Mr. Campbell "most certainly left it to men themselves to determine whether they knew that." And then at p. 8, A, it is stated, "that Christ said, 'This is my body broken for you.'" And "that the persons who could not come forward, and meet this, and say, Yes, it has been broken for me, could not answer the end designed by the celebration of the Lord's Supper."

In reference to the duty of self-examination which Mr. C. appears to have then treated, I am saved the necessity of quoting what Mr. Story has read to you from the work of John Knox, on the true meaning of 2 Cor. xiii. 5,—to which, in preaching from 1 Cor. xi. 28, Mr. C. referred, as the true import of a text which seemed (yet only seemed) to authorize an examination whether one is a believer or not. And I shall only observe, that various witnesses, for instance, at p. 34, G; p. 73, F; p. 75, A; p. 106, G; and p. 132, E, all speak, both as to the imperious duty, and as to the true footing of self-examination, previous to the partaking of the Lord's Supper—that he did not prohibit self-examination in unbelievers, but enjoined it on believers—not upon the assumption that they were in a wrong state—not that they might learn by some other means than in the simple consciousness of believing on the Lord, whether they were believing or not, (for, as at p. 76, D, faith is the condition of a Christian; and a man must know without any examination, whether he is believing or not,) but that they might consider whether they were in a condition to understand the Lord's word, and respond in the heart when he saith "It is broken for you,"—discerning the Lord's body—seeing that Christ had suffered for them,—and *entering into the communion of Christ's sufferings*, p. 106, G. I had



intended now to remark upon an argument from the Directory employed by a Rev. Member of Presbytery, upon this charge ; but I shall delay till he state it to the Synod, and conclude, for the present, reserving to myself the right to reply to whatever I may deem it necessary to comment upon, in what may fall from the Rev. Respondents—the Presbytery of Dumbarton.

Dr. Fleming's Answer,

Dr. Fleming, on behalf of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, began by reading the following passages from the book of Common Order, regarding the manner in which the ministers of the Church were to conduct that part of the Communion Service, denominated “fencing the tables.” “ And yet this, I pronounce not, to seclude anie penitent person how grievous soever his sinnes before have been, so that he feel in his heart unfained repentance for the same, but onlie such as continue in sinne without repentance. Neither yet is this pronounced against such as aspire to a greater perfection than they can in this present life attaine unto ; for, albeit we feel in our selves much fraillie and wretchednesse, as that we have not our faith so perfect and constant as we ought, being manie times readie to distrust God's goodnesse through our corrupt nature.” “ For the end of our coming thither, is not to make protestation that we are upright or just in our lives ; but contrariwise, we come to seeke our life and perfection in Jesus Christ, acknowledging in the mean time, that we of our selves be the children of wrath and damnation.”

Now, Sir, instead of this, Mr. Campbell is charged with teaching that no man should come to the Lord's table *seeking life*, but that he ought first to *have found life*. Farther, it is laid down in the book of Common Order, as a general admonition to all Christians, that this Sacrament is a comfortable help to all weak souls, &c. There is no assurance required here. Now, Sir, from the book of Common Order, I would come down to the instructions given in the

Directory for public worship ; and here I would re-state, in substance, what I understand the learned Counsel to have been alluding to. In appealing to the Directory, for the instructions that are given to ministers for fencing the tables, I admit that Mr. C. is not charged as having offended against the Directory. All that I seek from the Directory, is, to show what are the declared sentiments of the Standards of the Church, in reference to the way in which this duty is to be discharged. We shall afterwards see how Mr. C. has discharged it. "He is in especial manner to invite and encourage all that labour under the sense of the burden of their sins, and fear of wrath, and desire to reach out unto a greater progress in grace than yet they can attain unto, to come to the Lord's table ; assuring them, in the same name, of ease, refreshing, and strength to their weak and wearied souls." Here you will observe that, instead of requiring of people that partake of this holy ordinance a full assurance of their own salvation, the persons to be invited to it are those who are labouring under the fear of wrath. Again, I read from the answer to the 172d Question in the Larger Catechism. "One who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, may have true interest in Christ, though he be not yet assured thereof ; and in God's account hath it, if he be duly affected with the apprehension of the want of it, and unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ, and to depart from iniquity : in which case (because promises are made, and this sacrament is appointed, for the relief even of weak and doubting Christians) he is to bewail his unbelief, and labour to have his doubts resolved, and, so doing, he may and ought to come to the Lord's supper, that he may be further strengthened."

Now, Sir, it is the sixth charge against Mr. Campbell in the libel, that in that part of the communion service to which these documents refer, Mr. C. "debarred from the Lord's Supper, all who had not a personal assurance of their own

salvation." Now, to prove this charge, I do not understand it to be necessary to be made out that he used the word *debar*, or that he prohibited or warned all who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation, not to come to the table. If I understand the matter, the thing charged consists not in using the word "*debar*," nor in his *prohibiting* all who had not assurance, but in his so describing the character of worthy communicants, as to limit it to those who had personal assurance; and that instead of inviting and encouraging, in an especial manner, all who laboured under a sense of their own sins and fear of wrath, he represented the feast as prepared only for those who had persuaded themselves that their sins were pardoned, and that so far from having wrath to fear, they had nothing to do but give glory to God. I would just put it to the parties at the bar, that no other explanation can be given, except by confessing the most glaring inconsistency in some of the witnesses for the defender, whom I do not choose to name. At p. 61 A, B, C, of the printed evidence in this case, a witness swears that he heard no debarring—that Mr. C. forbade nobody, and he had watched narrowly. At p. 101, G, another witness swears, that if Mr. Campbell had debarred any one, he thinks he would have noticed it. Now, Sir, here are two witnesses, one swearing distinctly that Mr. C. forbade or debarred nobody; and another swearing that if Mr. C. had forbade any person, witness must have noticed it. Now, at p. 111, C, D, you find another of the defender's witnesses, who, being interrogated whether he heard Mr. C. *debar* or forbid any from coming to the table of the Lord: Depones and answers, Yes, deponent thinks he must. Being interrogated how Mr. C. did so: Depones, that he cannot speak to particular expressions—but just as is usually done to those that are living ungodly lives. Now, Sir, the inconsistency between the witnesses on this point, might be carried farther, but I rest here; for we have two declaring that they heard no debarring, and one declaring that he *certainly* did *debar*. Now, Sir, the only

way of bringing these conflicting evidences together, is by understanding the charge as I have now shortly explained it; for whether he forbade, or did not forbid, or whether he warned or did not warn, there can be no doubt that, in fencing the tables, he represented a personal assurance as absolutely necessary to a worthy communicant. In proof of this, we need only turn to Mr. C's own answers: at p. 67, he says, "I do not admit what is here charged, unless the Reverend Presbytery will understand, the testifying to the people, that none ought to go to the Communion table, unless they were in a condition to commemorate the love of Christ, as love to themselves individually, to be tantamount to it." I say, for one, that the Reverend Presbytery should understand this statement in no other way. But, Sir, we have not only his own admission, but at p. 105, A, of the Evidence, it is deponed, "that Mr. C. taught that in coming to the table of the Lord, a man must know that the body, of which the bread is the symbol, has been broken for him, and that the blood, of which the wine is the symbol, has been shed for him; and that Mr. C.," he adds, for I quote this part of the testimony in full, "that Mr. C. most certainly left it to men themselves to determine whether they knew that." It is most distinctly sworn, also, by John M'Farlane, p. 46, A, B, that Mr. C. insisted on personal assurance of salvation as essential to worthy communicating; and that, in consequence, he himself felt scruples about communicating. Robert M'Farlane, p. 20, C, D, "Depones, that the deponent did not join in the sacrament at Row on the last occasion, but he was present at the sermon by Mr. Campbell previous to the sacrament: Depones, that his reason for not joining was, that he did not think he was in the frame of mind which Mr. Campbell said was necessary for partaking of the ordinance: Depones, that he does not recollect what Mr. Campbell stated in regard to the frame of mind on that occasion." What that frame was we shall see afterwards. James Bain, p. 35, E, F, "Depones, that the deponent attended at the

celebration of the sacrament, in July 1830; and that Mr. Campbell, in his sermon, previous to the celebration of the ordinance, taught in substance, as the deponent understood, that whoever came to communicate, not having an assurance of his own sins being taken away, and of his being a child of God, and certain of his salvation, did not come worthily, and had no right to communicate." Peter M'Leod, p. 8, G, says the same thing. Mr. Lusk, at p. 37, A, understood Mr. C. to teach that no man whatever was in a fit state to partake of that ordinance who had not a present belief that Christ died for him. Now Sir, this present belief that Christ died for him is just the same with the assurance of salvation.

Dr. Hamilton's answer.

Dr. Hamilton, of Strathblane, next addressed the Synod in support of the judgment of the Presbytery: We regret exceedingly that, owing to the short-hand writer having heard Dr. Hamilton very imperfectly, his notes of this speech are such as to render it quite impossible to give any thing like a report of it.

Dr. Hamilton contended that all the charges in the major proposition of the libel were most completely substantiated. He read, from the printed notes of the sermon preached in the Floating Chapel at Greenock, the following passages:— " But if I am in circumstances to tell the man that his condemnation is taken away—that his sins are forgiven—that God is not imputing sin to him—if I can speak to him thus, ' That cause of distrust and fear which arises from your having broken God's law has been taken away, and you have been placed on this footing that now you can come to God with confidence as if you had never sinned;' you must see, if I can say this to a man, that the first great obstacle to his fearing God is taken away." " Now, inasmuch as it is true concerning you, that in the *first* place, the work of God in Christ has put away your sins, so that it is the fact, that

your sins are at this moment not imputed to you—inasmuch as it is true, in the *second* place, that the character of God, the real name of God, what he truly is, is revealed in this very work of God in Christ, so that no person can see that work and be ignorant of God—and, inasmuch as it is true, in the *third* place, that Christ has the Holy Ghost for you, that in the Spirit you may behold, and enter into, and dwell in this light of God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ—inasmuch as these things are true, you observe, that sinners as you are—that deserving of condemnation, and by nature under condemnation as you are—that notwithstanding all the evil of your circumstances as *these have arisen from the fall*—your *new* circumstances which have arisen from the *work of God in Christ*, are such, that it is perfectly reasonable to say to you, 'Fear God, and give him glory.' ”

He said that the Synod had themselves heard the defender, at the bar, both by his own mouth, and by his counsel, declare that he held the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon—they had heard him, at one time, make a distinction between the assurance of faith and the assurance of salvation, and, at another time, identify them. He said that when he (Dr. H.) had quoted the words of the Westminster Confession, stating that the principal acts of faith were receiving and accepting the Lord Jesus, while he stated, what that Confession also most distinctly declares, that assurance is not of the essence of faith, he had been denounced as having placed himself between the horns of a dilemma, and having contradicted himself. And this might show the consistency of the defender's doctrine, on this point, with the Standards of the Church.

Dr. H. remarked that the defender's Counsel had denounced the Presbytery, for having found the fourth charge proven, upon the testimony of a solitary witness. But this solitary witness was supported, at all events, by the defender himself; who says, in his answers, “The fourth count I do

not recognize in words ; and in so far as it is true, it corresponds with what I have stated above, on the subject of assurance of faith." And what is that statement ? At the middle of the 45th page of his answers, we read as follows : " And on this subject I hold and teach, that *in believing* the gospel, there is *necessarily* present in the mind, the *certainty* that the person believing is the object of God's love, manifested to him in the gift of Christ ; the certainty that he has remission of his sins, the gift of the Spirit, and all things pertaining to life and to godliness, bestowed on him, by the free grace of God ; so that he feels himself debtor to God for the gift of eternal life ; and this I hold to be *so* of the essence of faith, that is to say, so necessarily implied in the existence of true faith, that no person can be regarded as in the belief of God's testimony who is not conscious to it." On the next page we find this statement, " But, though on the one system, the denying that the atonement has been for all, and on the other system the denying that the atonement has accomplished remission of sins for all, have led to separating between the certainty of a truth of God's word, and the certainty of our own personal interest in his love, it is manifest, that where neither of these errors is held, but the true character of the atonement, as to its extent and its meaning, is recognised, there can be no indulgence extended to any uncertainty in the individual, as to his personal interest in all the promises of God, revealed to be believed ; nor can the darkness, or deadness, or want of enjoyment in God, of any one within hearing of the sound of the gospel, be ascribed to any other cause than the direct disbelief of that which the mouth of the Lord hath spoken."

I wish you, (Dr. H. remarked,) to attend particularly to this. Here he expressly asserts that darkness, or doubting, is not to be ascribed to any other cause than the direct disbelief of what the mouth of the Lord hath spoken. It is true, Mr. Campbell admits, that a believer may be found in a state

of doubt and uncertainty. But how? merely because he has sunk into a state of unbelief—and, according to him, in all cases of uncertainty, the person is distrusting and denying the direct word of God. The criminal cause to which he ascribes every state of despondency, is a demonstration how fully he holds the assurance of salvation to be of the very essence of faith.

The Rev. Dr. then shortly adverted to the evidence applicable to the different charges, and contended that it fully justified the finding of the Presbytery in every particular.

Mr. Carlyle then replied as follows :—

Moderator—I have only one or two observations to submit, in answer to those made by the reverend representatives of the Presbytery of Dumbarton. From what fell from Dr. Fleming, in his remarks on the book of Common Order, he appears to conceive Mr. C. to have taught, that a man who had once found life in knowing God, thenceforth ceased to seek it. This were fearful teaching indeed. But the very reverse of it is the burthen of the whole proof in the case, which gives us to understand, in almost every page, that *he alone*, who had found life in knowing God, ever began to seek life as the life of God; and that no man was really seeking life, but a man who had found it, in as much as to know God, is life; and he who knows not God, desireth not to know him—for it is only the knowledge of God that makes him desirable. The same remark might apply with almost equal force to the quotation regarding the acknowledgment of sin, which Dr. Fleming seemed to make, as if it implied, that the person, so acknowledging, was, on that account, not a believer. Whereas the whole of the proof, in regard to that matter, shows Mr. C.'s teaching to have been, that he alone saw sin in its true colours, who saw it in the light of God's love, manifested in giving his Son to the death, and that he alone was prepared, without hypocrisy, and without partiality, with a true heart before the true God, to acknow-



ledge sin not for the sake of obtaining a reward for that acknowledgment, but because he, having the mind of God who hateth sin, hateth sin likewise—first of all, in himself, and then in all the world. Now, Sir, before adverting to the Directory, which Dr. Fleming has cited, I would just remark, for a moment or two, upon a part of the evidence in regard to the debarring from the Lord's table, to which it appears that I have not called the attention of the Court. And you will find, that, so far from that part of the evidence running counter to my statement regarding Mr. C.'s true teaching on the subject, and regarding the perfect overthrow given by the evidence to the charge brought against him, that part of the evidence will be shown only the more completely to bear it out. For at p. 111, D, the witness "being interrogated whether deponent heard Mr. C. debar or forbid any from coming to the table of the Lord: Depones and answers, Yes, deponent thinks he must. Being interrogated how Mr. C. did so: Depones that he cannot speak as to particular expressions—but just as it is usually done to those that are living ungodly lives." If this is to be considered as proof that Mr. C. debarred from the Lord's table in an exceptionable way, I can only say, that it is a way usual with the Clergymen of the Church of Scotland. But only let us look at the sequel of the same testimony. At p. 112, C, interrogated whether "Mr. C. did, or did not, debar from the ordinance all who had not an assurance of their own salvation? Depones, that he *did not debar any such* from the ordinance—but said that they could not derive benefit from it, or worthily partake of it"—a testimony this which, while it totally neutralizes the attempt of the libellers, forms an addition to the many others which show that Mr. C. drew a definite line of distinction between the two things, which now seem altogether confounded, viz. the spiritual authority and the spiritual wisdom of a servant of the living God. Every servant of the living God has spiritual wisdom; and because a man receives

power or authority in the Church, he does not necessarily cease on that account to have spiritual wisdom. But every servant of the living God has not spiritual authority; for all but office-bearers, set by God in his Church for her government, are to be under subjection, and are to glory in being so, just as the Church herself is to glory in being under subjection to Christ. The minister is invested with authority—not man's, but God's, whose minister he is, be he faithful or treacherous. But here Mr. C. did not exercise authority. He did not debar those who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation; he only said, and said it not as his mind but as God's, that they could not derive that benefit from the Supper, or worthily partake of it. In this last he said just what any spiritual man might say.

Now, Sir, I shall advert for a very few minutes to the argument of Dr. Fleming, in reference to the Directory of our Church. And in the first place, I remark, that in it the clergyman is ordered to invite and encourage all that labour under the burden of their sins and fear of wrath, which evidently stands related to the evidence going to show that the difference between a believer and an unbeliever, is this, viz. that the latter went on willingly to sin, while to the former, sin became a burden. Now, they who feel *this* burden must be believers. Many men indeed, are under a sense or a burden of sin, who are not regenerate of the Spirit; but these persons contemplate sin, not as what it truly is, namely, coming short of the glory of God, but as something which shall affect their own selfish interests. And, on the other hand, no believer whatever is entitled to say that, for every sin he commits, he is not exposed to the fatherly chastisement of God,—for the wrath of God is assuredly revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men; and he that saith otherwise, on the ground that sin is not now imputed, understandeth not what he saith. Now, God, reveal-

ing his wrath against sin, is more especially vexed with sin in his regenerate creatures ; so that they who see his holiness and love may well experience the feelings above stated. And what confirms this interpretation of the passage, is, that the persons spoken of are said to be desiring “ to reach out unto a greater progress in grace.” Because if a man is desiring to reach on to a greater progress in grace, he must have made some advance in grace already. A man makes no such advance at all, but by being made a temple of the Holy Ghost—and a man never truly has any such desires for a greater progress in glorifying God, but by being a temple of the Holy Ghost, for this simple reason, because they are of those divine experiences, which belong not to the flesh at all. Nor can I neglect to add, that in 1 Cor. xi., the fatherly chastisements of God are set forth with a peculiar emphasis and breadth of application, in the words—applicable to us as truly as to that church. “ For this cause many are weak among you, and many sleep.” None but they who are in Christ, are ever said to sleep when they die.

The next observation I make on the Directory is, that therein the minister is commanded to give thanks for the Sacrament, “ by which Christ and all his benefits are applied and sealed up unto us,” and to make mention of Christ, as he alone by whom, “ we have access to the throne of grace—are admitted to eat and drink at his own table, and are sealed up by his Spirit to an assurance of happiness and everlasting life,”—to say, “ Take ye—eat ye—this is the body of Christ *which is broken for you*,”—and to observe similar language regarding the wine, *i.e.* “ drink *ye all* of it,” &c.—which expressions certainly import, if language can, that the assurance of faith is pre-supposed to be exercised by every worthy communicant, for how is it possible that the minister could be enjoined to perform such an act of daring hypocrisy, as to tell those for whom the body of Christ might not have bee

broken—that it had been—or to ask those to receive it as broken for them—whom he never expected to respond—yea, Lord, for us.

In the third place, while the Directory is to be “carefully and uniformly observed and practised,” it is “without prejudice to the order and practise of this Kirk, in such particulars as are appointed by the Books of Discipline and acts of General Assemblies, and are not otherwise ordered and appointed in the Directory,” p. 523. Now, the first book of Discipline, Dunlop’s Confess. vol. ii. p. 585, recommends to use “sharp examination rather than indulgence in admitting, to their great mysteries, such as be ignorant of the use and virtue of the same;” and he adds, that none is to be admitted who “understandeth not the use and virtue of this holy Sacrament.” Therefore, place a man at the table of the Lord, under a minister of Christ, who is giving him bread and wine, as being signs and seals of the body and blood of the Lord—not physically as with the Papists—not mechanically—not formally—not in any other way whatever save by being truly alive to God—beholding his face at the time—and discerning the gift of God—and ask the man in that situation, whether he knows the use and virtue of this holy sacrament? unless he sees Christ in it for him;—and ask the minister, whether he sees its use and virtue—unless he sees Christ in it for them that eat and drink?—and they must admit that without such a perception, there is in the supper neither use nor virtue at all—unless, indeed, the use of dishonouring Christ—and the virtue of treasuring up wrath. How a man can possibly say, “I do this in remembrance of Christ, unless his soul is taking Christ by faith at the time, as truly as his body is taking the bread and the wine, I cannot; in the least degree apprehend—I am not called to discern any object of faith in myself, but I am called to discern the Lord’s body.”

In the last place, I would observe, that although it is

quite competent for Dr. Fleming to adduce the Directory as illustrative of the state of doctrine at a particular period of the church, it is equally incompetent for him to adduce it as the test by comparison with which to prove that Mr. C. is in heresy. For there is nothing said in the major proposition of the libel about the Directory at all; and, therefore, though it may be properly cited as an authority, it cannot be a rule of judgment in this cause. I shall now, Sir, trouble you, in conclusion, with a word on some observations by Dr. Hamilton. I confess I was very much astonished, after all that has been said to illustrate the radical distinction which men, upon oath, have made between Mr. C.'s teaching on the assurance of faith, and that on the assurance of salvation, to hear the Rev. Dr. say, that I have been confounding the two; and still more astonished, if possible, was I to hear the Rev. Dr. seriously quote the Larger Catechism as contradicting the doctrine; that assurance of faith is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation. For he is, in so doing, just running into the very confusion which he charges upon me. What the Larger Catechism, Q. 172, condemns, is the idea that assurance of *salvation* is of the essence of faith; and that is not only what Mr. C. has not taught, but what he expressly contradicts,—because he teaches, that assurance of salvation springs from *that* assurance which is of the essence of faith.

Finally, Sir, Dr. H. observed, that Mr. C., in his teaching, gives no indulgence to uncertainty, to darkness and deadness, attributes it all to the disbelief of what the Lord has spoken, and while he admits that a believer may doubt, teaches, that when he doubts, all his doubting proceeds from unbelief. From the way in which Dr. H. made this statement, I conceived him to express his disapprobation of such teaching, and to rank it among the multifarious heresies which are imputed to Mr. C. If he did not do, or mean to do so, I much rejoice; if he did, I am very much grieved. For,

to say that there is any thing but unbelief of God, and sin in the sight of God, in the uncertainty, darkness, and deadness of regenerate men, is only one step to saying, that there are no unbelief and no sin in the uncertainty, darkness, and deadness of unregenerate men. It just results in this, that God is revealed only as a partial object of trust—that he is not dishonoured by distrust—or that he is content to be dishonoured. It comes to this, that He, who has sent his Son to be the light of the world, to make mankind light in the Lord, by faith—He whose word abideth for ever, is nevertheless a God whom if we believe, we are not sure that we may or need to enjoy or trust to be delivered by—whom, if we believe, we may well enough be destitute of the peace which they have who are justified by faith—destitute of joy in believing—destitute of light and counsel—destitute of consolation in the Holy Ghost. All unbelief, all distrustfulness, springs from ignorance of God, and all ignorance of God is sin, black sin—it is rebellion against him, direct and active; for it is his will that he be known, and enjoyed, and obeyed. And if this be heresy, to teach that, although a man may be tempted of the Devil to forsake the light, yet all his doubt, and darkness, and deadness, are positive sins against a Father's authority and love,—then, Sir, in the name of my Rev. Client, I unhesitatingly say, “After the way that is called heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers.”

Dr. Begg, of New Monkland.

The learned counsel directed your attention to the subject at very considerable length. I give him all the credit for having done the best he could for his client; but I am sorry that, in doing so, he should have brought forward, in the presence of this Court, such a variety of heterodox and erroneous notions, mixed up with a variety of very important truths, so as, if possible, to impose on the understandings, and lead away the attention of this Court from the proper

object that is before us. There has been a statement of a great variety of truths mixed up with Arminian and Antinomian heresies, and doctrines of the Church of Rome, so as to impose on the understandings of the multitude who are present. I need not remind you, Sir, that the gentleman at your bar is a special pleader, and he did the best he could, as in duty bound, for the interest of his client; but you will remember that the language of a special pleader is not to be taken as expressing any sentiments of his own, and, therefore, the Court, and the multitude who are present, will remember that, and not be led away by the sophistry of the learned counsel.

Having said so, Moderator, I now state to you that I think we have heard, from the Presbytery of Dumbarton, clear and distinct answers to the arguments of the learned counsel; and the proof that I hold in my hand, is the most clear and distinct evidence that the charges against Mr. Campbell are fully established. I have no doubt on the subject; and if I had any doubt, Mr. Campbell, last night, gave sufficient evidence from his own mouth: his own statements even went farther than the proof which is now in the hands of every member of this Court. The doctrines of universal atonement and pardon, and that the assurance of faith is essential to salvation, are clearly made out. The learned counsel has been endeavouring to draw a distinction between the assurance of faith and salvation, and, on this subject, called Dr. Hamilton to account. The evidence which I hold in my hand, in regard to this point, is clear and distinct. I call your attention to the subject for a single moment, for it is unnecessary to detain you longer. At p. 43, of the printed evidence, Peter Bain, teacher at Gareloch-head, and a member of the Church, "Depones, that it was usual with Mr. C., to divide his hearers into two classes, viz. those who had assurance of personal salvation and those who had not—and he said that the one class were true

Christians, and the others were not: Depones, that this occurred frequently: Depones, that the deponent was informed by an uncle of his, now dead, that in the end of September 1829, Mr. Campbell had visited him as a sick or dying person, and about a fortnight before his death, and, at this visit, that Mr. Campbell said to him that he was in hell, and that he was worse than a pagan, because he did not see his sins pardoned." I am horrified, Moderator, while reading the words. Can there be any more striking proof of the evil and dangerous effects of such doctrines, as that this should be said to a man on the brink of eternity; and this by a man who has declared, in the most solemn manner, that he would teach the word of God according to the Standards of our Church? I say that he is a traitor to the Church.

I have heard much of Mr. C. as being a good man, a pious and a polite gentleman. I never spoke to him, and never saw him but once before the meeting of this Court. But I came to this Court with the most favourable impression that he was acting in a most conscientious manner; and I trusted that he would give such explanations as would satisfy the Court regarding the doctrines which he was said to teach. But, Moderator, when I see him plead his cause, as he did last night, I cannot give him credit for all that respectability of character which he has received from the public. If he were an honest man, if he were a true Christian, if he had the fear of God before his eyes, he would have come forward and said, "I have changed my opinions—I swore to, and subscribed, with my hand, the Confession of Faith, but I am now convinced that the doctrines contained in it are not according to the word of God, and I give up my charge." But, acting as he has done, and still continues to do, and, while continuing within the pale of the Church, openly, and in the presence of this Court, endeavours to vilify the Standards of this Church, and to gloss over, and pervert the word of God, and thus endeavouring to vindicate his own



improper conduct—acting, I say, in this manner, I cannot give him credit for that respectability of character which has been reported of him. To tell a man who was on the verge of the grave that he was in hell because he had not the assurance of salvation, is too horrible a thing to think of, and it cannot be suffered that he should be allowed to continue in our Church. This Court will be condemned in their own consciences, condemned by the world, condemned by the Great Master whom they serve, if they do not put a stop to such proceedings. I make no motion on the subject. I leave this to some other reverend father.

Principal M'Farlane.

Moderator—I believe we are at length come to the last of the series of complaints and appeals, by which so many questions connected with this process have been brought before us. Late as the hour is, and exhausted as many of us are, I feel perfectly confident that a great many feel, like my reverend friend who last addressed you, a powerful inclination to animadvert at large on many of the most extraordinary statements to which we have listened. For two days has this Synod been addressed on the subject of these appeals, and on the principles and views which have given rise to them, not only at a length which is altogether unexampled in the history of ecclesiastical procedure ; but also, I must say, in a spirit, and tone, and manner, different from any thing I was ever compelled to listen to. I do not, however, think the time mispent ; and much as I may regret that such a spirit has been indulged in, and such a tone assumed, I feel convinced that, under the over-ruling providence of God, the circumstance will not be without its advantages, in exhibiting to all who have witnessed it, in a manner not to be mistaken or misunderstood, the practical effect of the opinions advocated, and the intellectual character and moral feelings of those by whom they are held. Still I cannot help stating that the tempta-

tion to indulge in extended remark on the subject is one which ought to be resisted. It is one which I desire myself to resist for the reasons which have been stated, particularly that the decision of this question, as of many others, is contingent on the decision of that which we had under consideration last night—as the discussion of this, and the other questions, must depend upon the decision of the Court of Review, as to our finding of last night, and however confident we may be, that our judgment will be confirmed we are not to take it for certain.

I think that this question should be referred *simpliciter* to the Assembly, and that we should send it there not prejudged by any judicial sentence or opinion of ours. I therefore move that the Synod do refer the appeals and complaint, now heard, *simpliciter* to the General Assembly.

Dr. M'Lean.

I am unwilling to trouble the Court after the long and painful sederunts they have had upon the question. In the remarks that I have to make, I shall begin with telling you, that I have no objections whatever that you refer this question to the Assembly, but I would not say *simpliciter*. We refer it on the principle that we are satisfied that our judgment would be of no avail ; and that it must go there whether we decide upon it or not.

I have no particular interest in the question other than a Christian minister ought to have ; but I am vexed to the bottom of my heart, that whilst in London we have an individual of our church searching after the millenium, and other extravagancies, and, in our own Synod, others uttering such doctrines as we have heard in this court, that our neighbours should have to say, that the Church of Scotland was going about with a fool's coat upon its back, and thus exposing our church to the scorn and contempt of all rational people.

I have heard statements from the bar, yesterday and to-day, such as I never heard in my life. It strikes my heart with sorrow when I think that any man who has subscribed the Confession of Faith, should tell me that the compilers of it had not done their duty. I am shocked also, that in a complaint and dissent of this kind, we are bearded by the appellants, who say to us, "you know nothing at all about the matter; you must come to these two or three people (pointing to the bar), to learn what truth is:" and I understand that there were some attempts to pray that we should be enlightened on the subject. The thing is perfectly shocking—there is nonsense on the face of it.

You will allow me to say, that we have heard many learned discussions about the Book of Common order, and about various Confessions of Faith—the Geneva Confession, the Helvetian Confession, the Augsburg Confession, and others; nay, we have heard even of the Council of Trent, and of other wonderful authorities; but how all these came to be mixed with this case, surprises me. We, Sir, have no connexion with any Confession, but the Westminster Confession of Faith; we have to do with nothing but with the word of God and this Confession of Faith; and if you go beyond that, you stultify the law of the land. You may just as well tell us about vitrified forts, or any thing else in natural history, as tell us about Geneva Confessions, or Wirtemberg Confessions, or any other Confession than the Westminster Confession of Faith, to which all of us have subscribed in the most solemn manner. We heard that the Council of Trent maintained the doctrine of universal atonement—what is that to us. I believe, Moderator, that this question has been brought before us to produce an effect—and if you have not the common sense and common honesty to show that you have principles, and believe ~~them~~ to be according to the word of God—if you have not this, you deserve to be turned out of your pulpits. I was astonished at

this Synod, yesterday, listening to the nonsense and absurdity that was uttered by the complainer. You had no right to listen to what he dared to utter in regard to the compilers of our Standards, and his telling you about Geneva and Helvetican Confessions, with which we have nothing whatever to do. I must say, Moderator, that I never heard worse pleading than by the appellants. They, no doubt, will be of the same mind in regard to me; and they have a right to this opinion; and I care not if they form it. All I wish, Moderator, is, that if there be any individuals who wish to join them in their heretical notions, I wish them all to go in the same boat.

With regard to publications, I may have seen some on the subject; indeed, I had one sent me, and I have a conjecture from whence it came. I never saw such an absurdity. If the author of it will make himself known to me, I shall give him my opinion freely of his publication. A man that could lend his labour to such nonsense, is the very worst enemy to religion—he is wounding it in the house of its friends.

I must say that I sympathise with the Presbytery of Dumbarton; and the only objection that I have to the proposal of my reverend friend, is, that, after we have heard such pleading from the bar by the Presbytery, I do not think it fair that we should send away the question to the Assembly, without any opinion as to their conduct. I highly approve of the conduct of the Presbytery of Dumbarton; and they are entitled to the highest commendation of the Synod, although they do not care a straw, perhaps, about our opinion. But still we are not worthy members of the Synod, if we do not give them that approbation which they deserve for their conduct from beginning to end. I trust, if the same reverend fathers go to the Assembly, that they will make the same display that they have done here; and if the Assembly do not approve of their conduct, I am much mistaken; and if they do not drive out such unworthy members of our Church as we have had the pain to listen to, let the Church

of Scotland look to it, and take its chance of the evils that must inevitably result from it.

The Rev. Mr. Leishman, of Govan.

It is difficult to say who is most entitled to sympathy in this case ; it is a most unpleasant one for all concerned. I do not think that the Synod will do their duty if they shrink from giving an opinion on the evidence, now that it has been forced upon them. If an opinion is not pronounced by the Synod, it will go abroad that the members entertain doubts whether the charges are brought home, while I am very much mistaken if any such doubts exist.

In what has been said, Mr. Campbell's integrity has been adverted to, and called in question. Now, I cannot agree with my reverend father in doing so ; but, on the contrary, feel myself bound to say, that Mr. Campbell has given us a proof of his integrity, for we have heard him avow the doctrines he holds without any mincing.

Mr. Leishman then repeated some expressions in Mr. Campbell's speech before the Synod, on the preceding night, in which he had asserted that "he never heard a passage quoted from Scripture, which it was even pretended was a positive limitation of the death of Christ ; and that the objection to the doctrine that Christ died for all men, resolved itself into a principle, which, if it were held consistently, would lead to this, that God has no moral character at all ;" and also, another passage, where Mr. Campbell distinctly declared that the assurance of God's love was so of the essence of faith, that no man could be believing what God had revealed of himself without having it.

Mr. Henderson, of Carmunnock.

I rise to express my entire concurrence in the motion that has been made by the Rev. Principal ; and to say that I enter most warmly into the approbation given by my reverend

friend, Dr. M'Lean, to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, for their conduct on this most painful and most important case.

But while I give my hearty concurrence to every thing said by my reverend friend, I think it much better that it should be referred *simpliciter* to the Assembly. I must, at the same time, express the pain and the abhorrence with which I listened to the pleadings at the bar, both yesterday and to-day, in which we have heard doctrines propounded to us, which are not only at variance with the Scriptures, but with common sense, which would lead altogether to the subversion of the true setting forth of the truth as it is in Jesus; and which seem, not only by the appearances at the bar on this occasion, but by many other things, to carry with them a feeling of excitement, which they may call religion, but which, I say, is an excitement which was not all necessary to sustain our fathers amid the trials of their Christian pilgrimage, or our martyrs amid the cruelties of their glorious deaths; and which would build the hope of a Christian on a foundation that has no ground whatever in Scripture. The only foundation of a sinner's hope, is the perfect work of Christ; and till we are led by grace to believe the record, and have experience of the power of that record, we are not permitted to entertain any confidence. No, Sir; and I feel, respecting what has been said, in the pleadings at the bar, on the subject of universal atonement and pardon, that while they carry something along with them which, by the pleadings of these gentlemen, I am at a loss distinctly to understand, I say most positively, that the answer to all that has been said on these points, is just what was so well and ably stated last night by Dr. Hill, that it is the real, and unequivocal, and clearly stated doctrine of our Standards, that every saving grace has an essential connexion with the atonement of Jesus Christ; and that there is not such a thing as having any thing that pertains to the salvation of the soul, till once that ~~man~~ has an interest in that atonement, through the faith of

Jesus ; and I conclude in the language of the Apostle, " Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Dr. Dewar,

Without entering into this subject, I may remark, that it is impossible for any one who has listened to the statements yesterday and to-day, to have any doubt on his mind that the doctrines which are taught, and which have been taught by Mr. Campbell, are at variance with the word of God, and with the Standards of our church. I noticed last night, that in the whole of these statements, there are mixed up with very important truths, monstrous and pernicious errors ; and I have no doubt at all but pious persons are led away by the mixture of truths, very important and very essential truths, which have been brought forth and stated at the bar. For example, it was stated at the bar last night, that the atonement is a proof of the love of God to mankind. Who has ever doubted this ? It is the doctrine of Scripture and of the Standards of our Church, that there is a complete, and full, and free salvation for sinners of all nations, and characters, and descriptions, nay, for the very chief of sinners ; and that the ministers of the gospel are authorized and warranted to preach the gospel to every creature, to receive the blessing of a free and a full salvation. But, Sir, while we maintain this as most precious truth, we hold that the sinner is pardoned only when he believes the gospel. This is the doctrine held by the Reformed Church, by Arminians, as well as Calvinists ; for Arminians maintain, that mankind are put into a salvable state by the death of Christ : but they have never yet maintained that all men are actually pardoned. This is a doctrine, I shall not say reserved, for the gentleman at the bar, but by him it has been revived, and this is the doctrine which has been taught by one of the ministers of your Church. This I call a most pernicious error, subversive

of all the doctrines of the gospel, and of the high interests of morality. The gentlemen at the bar will allow me to say a few words to enlighten them, since they have said so much to enlighten us.

I have to express my admiration of the manner in which the question has been conducted by the Presbytery of Dumbarton. I never heard clearer statements than those made last night and to-day ; and, altogether, they are highly deserving of the approbation and thanks of the Synod. But I hope that the motion submitted to the Court will be agreed to, because it is certain that, whatever decision we give, the case will go to the Assembly ; and, also, because it is not a question of local interest—the whole Church of Scotland, the whole Church of Christ, is deeply concerned in the decision of the question. And I would refer it also, because there is ambiguity in the terms in which the Assembly expressed its deliverance at the last meeting. For these reasons, we shall do well to refer the whole matter to the decision of the Assembly.

Dr. Stewart of Erskine, and Mr. Geddes of Paisley, spoke next, but were not heard by the short-hand writers.

Dr. McFarlane, of St. Enoch's.

I have to express my deep regret that the appellants came forward on this occasion, (notwithstanding the wish of the Synod, expressed to them, to refer the question to the General Assembly,) to engage in a pleading that could not have ended in a final decision for or against them. I do not impute motives to any man, or any class of men, in the proceedings they may think proper to adopt. Let their own consciences admonish them as to what was their motive. I rise for the purpose of adverting to the question now before you, whether you shall refer this matter *simpliciter* to the Assembly, or along with the expression of your opinion on the



subject. This is the only question we are engaged in discussing, and on which I intend to make a few observations. I must say, that, if I yielded to my feelings, I would be for adding something to the reference. I have only heard a part of the proceedings of this day, but I heard the whole yesterday; and I must say, that such audacity in proclaiming the appellant's opposition to the Church of which he allows himself to be a member, I could not have imagined it would ever have been my lot to hear from any minister of the Church of Scotland. Besides, there has been, along with this bold declaration, a silence on a most important part of his creed, I mean the doctrine of universal pardon. And, looking to the proof, I must say, that he is there convicted of holding sentiments diametrically opposite to those which he expressed to us yesterday evening; and, therefore, if I would listen to my feelings, I would say, add to the reference a strong expression of the displeasure of this Court.

Then, again, if I were to listen to my feelings towards the Presbytery of Dumbarton, I would say the same thing; for that not only have the Presbytery, in so far as they went up to the proof, conducted themselves in a regular manner, but with the most astonishing forbearance towards the individual at the bar. He had polluted the whole country with heresy; every person was aware that he was preaching doctrines in direct opposition to the truth as it is in Jesus; and, notwithstanding of this, the Presbytery did not yield to the solicitations at first presented to them, to engage in this prosecution. Throughout the whole, they acted to him with kindness and Christian forbearance, which he did not acknowledge yesterday. I know not whether he has done so this evening; but so far as I know, he has made no allusion to their forbearance and kindness towards him. He was bound in courtesy to have acknowledged this; but he has not, as I understand, made the slightest allusion to it. Therefore, were I to yield to my feelings, I would add something to the

reference. But I must object to making any addition. There are some of the members of this Court who will, of course, be judges in this case in the higher Court. Now, if you were to send the case to the Assembly with an expression of any opinion on the subject, you are virtually prejudging the case; and, I hesitate not to say, that it would be a strong ground of objection to the members of this Synod taking a part in the proceedings of the Assembly; for, depend upon it, the individuals at the bar would perceive it, (for they are marvellously quick-sighted in a thing of this kind,) and they would at once take it up against the reference from this Synod to the Assembly. I say, therefore, let the reference be simpliciter.

But, it has been said, that we ought to give an opinion for the sake of the Presbytery of Dumbarton; but in doing this, you would not only be prejudging the case, but you are doing that which our friends do not wish should be done. They are satisfied if we give, individually, our approbation of their conduct, as members of this court. We shall state in the Assembly our honest opinion upon this point, approving of these parts of the procedure which we do approve, and expressing our opinion honestly, where we may happen to differ from them. This is the wish of our reverend friends, and that wish, I have no doubt, will be acquiesced in. I trust that Dr. McLean will not divide the Synod, and that we shall be all unanimous on the subject.

After a few explanatory remarks from Dr. McLean and Principal McFarlane, the Synod agreed to refer the case simpliciter, to the ensuing General Assembly, from which resolution Mr. Wyllie, of Carlisle, dissented.



## APPENDIX.

---

Report of the Meeting of the Presbytery of Dumbarton on the 29th March, 1831, when they found the libel against Mr. Campbell proven.

Mr. M'George, for the libellers, stated that he had, up to that moment, been expecting Mr. Brown, their counsel, from Edinburgh, but that, owing to some circumstance unknown to him, he had not come. That, expecting Mr. Brown, he had not prepared himself to make any remarks upon the evidence, and was therefore under the necessity of leaving the matter in the hands of the Presbytery, not doubting that the members were well able, without any assistance from him, to give a just judgment in the case.

Mr. Carlyle, counsel for Mr. Campbell, was then heard at considerable length. He went over the evidence, and contended that whatever Mr. Campbell had admitted, in his answers, was fully proved, and that whatever he had denied was completely disproved.

As the same ground was gone over before the Synod, the proceedings of which are fully reported, it has been thought unnecessary to report here any of the arguments upon the evidence made use of, either by Mr. Carlyle or any member of the Presbytery.

Parties having been removed, the Moderator called upon the members of Court to give their opinions, which they did *serialim* as follows :

Dr. Grahame.

Moderator,—In rising up to give an opinion on this case, I beg leave to congratulate you, and this Court, that this arduous business is drawing to a close, and that we have now before us the prospect of a speedy termination to our labours. We have been engaged in an investigation both tedious and troublesome. After much preparatory labour, we found reason to appoint Mr.

C. to be served with a libel. We have taken proof both for the libellers and the defender. We have heard counsel at the bar, as to the import of that evidence, and it remains for us now to give our judgment.

Before giving any opinion, I feel it right to remind the Court that this is no business of our seeking—that it was with great reluctance that we admitted any charge to be preferred against Mr. C., and that it was with great delay and hesitation that we received the complaint of his parishioners. Our motive in this was, no doubt, in some respects, personal—for, independent of our feelings to Mr. C., we could not but see that we were engaging in a business full of delicacy. In a body like the established Church of Scotland it happens that there are occasionally some unworthy members admitted into the Church; and there are instances in which their immorality is known, and comes to be investigated in the Church courts. But this is not a case of immorality, but a much more delicate one, of heresy—a matter, Sir, in regard to which, during the whole of the present generation, there has been peace and tranquillity in the churches of our land: and I believe, Sir, till this unfortunate event happened, all of us expected that the peace of the church would not, in our day, be disturbed by the din of heresy; and the disappointment was great when this untoward event occurred, not only within the bosom of our Church, but within the bounds of our own Presbytery. It being a new case we felt distrustful of ourselves, and determined to proceed with the greatest caution in a case peculiarly delicate. We were anxious to obtain all information possible for us to reach, and made use of that information so as to give no offence to any one party. We therefore, if we erred at all, erred upon the side of lenity and indulgence; and allowed the parties at the bar the widest latitude possible, in searching into the opinions referred to—and I must say that the conduct of the gentlemen at the bar has been most honourable to themselves. We were strangers to technical subtleties, but they showed no disposition to take advantage of these to get us into a dilemma. And I must also remark, Sir, that the same spirit of forbearance which we manifested to the counsel at the bar, we manifested also to the witnesses, while engaged in making their depositions before us. There was no disposition, on the part of the counsel on either

side, to entrap any witness, or to involve him in any difficulty or contradiction, in which he would either have to give up his consistency or veracity. But had there been any such disposition we would not have allowed them to do so. On the contrary, we endeavoured to protect the witnesses—to encourage them, to exempt them from every species of intimidation, or even disapprobation that was expressed in our presence; and when we found them labouring for expressions we were willing to allow them such assistance as the counsel at the bar were willing to give—and when seemingly running into contradictions, we pointed it out to them, that they might save themselves from apparent inconsistency.

By this means we have got much information ourselves—some of it is useless, but most part of it forms a valuable record. It is this mass of evidence before us that we are now called to weigh, and pronounce our verdict upon.

Of the evidence before us, the first, and unquestionably the most valuable part, is the evidence of Mr. C. himself—the answers that he has given to us in his own name. I shall briefly advert to this document. The doctrines which Mr. C. is charged with teaching and promulgating are stated, in the libel, to be two,—the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, as also the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation. Now if Mr. C. admit, in express terms, that he has taught both these doctrines, I think it a sufficient proof that he is chargeable with the crime libelled.

As to the first doctrine, I shall put it in his own words. I had one or two passages marked for this purpose, but my learned and able friend, (Mr. Gregor)—I call him an able man, more in reference to his mind than his body,—has pointed out a shorter process. It is that which occurs in the 15th page of his answers, near the bottom of the page. After saying, first, that these doctrines are the doctrines of Scripture, he goes on to say, “It may give distinctness to consider universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, here stated as one doctrine, *as in truth they are*, separately,” an admission that Mr. C. holds that these two doctrines are one doctrine. Then he goes on to state, “As to the extent of the atonement, I hold and teach that Christ

died for all men," &c. and of course he holds and teaches that Christ has pardoned the sins of all men.

Now, Sir, the next doctrine libelled, is the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation. I am aware, Sir, that, according to the doctrine of this church, the assurance of faith and the assurance of salvation are two distinct things, but I am certain also that the light in which this church considers assurance of salvation forms no part of the creed of Mr. C. He gives a definition of what the faith of assurance is, a little past the middle of the 44th page of his answers, "Faith being the belief of God's testimony, assurance of faith should properly mean the confidence in its reality, with which *the thing testified* is contemplated; and this is the Scripture use of the word;" but he goes on to add, "at the same time it is likely, and may be assumed, that the expression is used in the libel in the sense in which it is usually employed in theological writings: In these it is rather the feeling of *personal interest* in the thing believed, than of the reality of the thing itself, that is intended to be expressed. At the same time, seeing that the words of God are spoken to us *personally*, and intended to be received *as life to ourselves individually*, there is not much reason to complain of this liberty taken with the expression 'Assurance of Faith.'"

This is pretty explicit—but if you go on to the next page, about the middle of it, you will find that the language is still stronger. "And on this subject I hold and teach, that *in believing* the gospel, there is *necessarily* present in the mind, the *certainty* that the person believing is the object of God's love, manifested to him in the gift of Christ—the certainty that he has remission of his sins, the gift of the Spirit, and all things pertaining to life and to godliness, bestowed on him by the free grace of God; so that he feels himself debtor to God for the gift of eternal life; and this I hold to be so of the essence of faith—that is to say, so necessarily implied in the existence of true faith, that no person can be regarded as in the belief of God's testimony who is not conscious to it."

Now, in the name of common sense, I ask, can any man misunderstand this?—Is there not here sufficient proof that the doctrines charged in the libel are rightly charged?

Now, Sir, it may be asked, if the matter charged is so explicitly—

admitted, what need of further evidence? If Mr. C. has admitted, in express words, the doctrines libelled, one would think that his own admission is enough. But there is a good deal of mystification in some of his statements—a good deal of what is called darkening counsel by words without knowledge, and therefore we wished for farther proof. All men have a notion of what pardon is—yet this plain thing, which the meanest individual understands—a child, when he asks to be pardoned, knows what he means—we have not been able to get an intelligible explanation of. Mr. C. has given us, at the 35th page of his book, something like an account of what pardon means. He has given us three senses of the word pardon, and tells us that the third and last is the sense in which he uses it—“That it is an act of God, referring to a sinner, by which he declares his having sinned to be no longer any barrier to his returning to the enjoyment of the light of God’s love and favour; making the consciousness of guilt to be no longer a just cause of fear, in seeking the face of God; yea, giving the assurance that it is not only a righteous thing in God to receive back into favour, not taking into account the sin justly chargeable against him, but even, so to speak, to help him back, and by his own Spirit to lift him up into the light of his own love, and enjoyment of his own holiness. In this sense I do hold it.” Such is the description Mr. C. gives of pardon.

Speaking of faith, he says, It creates nothing—I think we cannot say so much of his description of pardon. It does create something, Sir,—but I may refer it to you, whether it creates light or creates darkness. It was some feeling about these nice distinctions—so nice as to be almost unintelligible and impalpable—that created something like a wish to come a little more closely into contact with Mr. C.’s explanation of his own doctrine, and to arrive at this there was no other method, that we could adopt, except to lead a proof. This might have been saved by one process. Mr. C. had preached a number of sermons, which, some way or other, came to be published. Now, if Mr. C. had admitted that these were a fair representation of what he taught and preached, it would have been perfectly sufficient to enable us to make up our minds as to the nature of that doctrine which he has been preaching, and saved us seven days and nearly seven



nights, in taking a proof. We have now, therefore, to consider what is the amount of the information we are to gather from the evidence of the witnesses examined on this subject.

The Rev. Dr. then went over the different counts in the libel, and, at considerable length, examined the evidence applicable to each.—In the course of which he made the following remarks:—In concluding my remarks, I must state that the criticisms at the bar have been very much refinements upon words—that there was an accuracy expected in the witnesses that was unattainable in the state in which human nature is placed. Did I hear men swearing positively to the precise words they had heard many months before, unless they took notes of them at the time, I could not but believe that they gave their evidence from something else than their recollection of what they heard. The accuracy for which the counsel pleads is not attainable by inspiration itself. The Evangelists tell us that there was an inscription placed upon the cross by order of Pilate, and the whole four Evangelists give us each of them a copy of the inscription, and there is a discrepancy between the whole four: and yet we all say that this, instead of being a proof of falsehood, is the very circumstance that strongly confirms the truth of the statement: such circumstantial differences is a proof of the veracity of the witnesses.

I shall now read the general finding to which I propose we should come, founded upon the explanations which I have now made: “The Presbytery having considered the libel, answers of the defender, and the proof adduced by the parties, find that the 1st, 2d, 4th, 6th, and 9th counts of the libel are fully proven.—That the 3d and 5th are proven by one witness, whose deposition is corroborated by the general depositions of the other witnesses. But the acts charged in these counts took place in the preceding month of September, and not in the month of October as laid in the libel.—And that the 8th count is also proved by one witness, whose deposition is corroborated by the general depositions of other witnesses—and in respect whereof, (*i. e.* in respect of the admission of Mr. C. and the deposition of witnesses,) find that the defender has entertained and promulgated the doctrines of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, and also that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation; and the Presbytery considering farther that they

are precluded, by the remit of the General Assembly, from pronouncing sentence; refer the whole to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, that they may pronounce a final judgment."

Dr. Hamilton.

We would have rejoiced that no foundation had existed for any complaint or process against Mr. C.—We would have rejoiced that he would have persevered diligently in teaching his people agreeably to the Scriptures, and the Confession and Catechisms of our church.—We would have rejoiced that he had exerted all his powers to have made his doctrines intelligible—to have shown the entire harmony between his tenets and the word of God, and our Standards. I am sorry to say, that the whole proof is of a description that conducts us to the conclusion, that his language is of such a nature, as to render plain subjects unintelligible. He has perverted and misapplied the words of Scripture, and the words of the very Standards which he solemnly pledged himself to observe. The incarnation of Christ—the mission of Christ into the world, he calls pardon, while our Standards declare, that it is in justification that God freely pardons all our sins.

It has been questioned again and again, at the witnesses, whether unbelief is forgiven, and, after all the evidence we have heard, unless I take the authority of the most respectable gentleman who is his counsel, I could not say, from the witnesses, whether, according to his views, unbelief is pardoned or not. This I am bound to regard as the holding of Mr. C. that unbelief is not an act but a state. If this state of unbelief is sinful, it is a wonder that it is not included in the forgiveness, but if not sinful it can require no forgiveness. Yet that state we are told, is not pardoned, but all its consequences are pardoned. The whole of his teaching is a strange misapprehending of the meaning of religious language, and is the origin of much perversion and misrepresentation.

The doctrines which he is charged with teaching have been clearly brought home to him by the proof. To make this clear—just suppose that the Bible, in place of declaring that Christ loved *the church* and gave himself for her—that he purchased

*the church* with his own blood—that he has laid down his life *for his sheep*,—just suppose that the Bible taught that he has loved the world and given himself for it—that he purchased the world with his own blood; and suppose that our Standards had been framed upon that principle, and, that instead of the answer we have in our Catechism to the question, Did God leave all mankind in this state of sin and misery—which states that God having out of his mere good pleasure elected some to everlasting life, &c.—that instead of limiting the extent of the atonement, as our Confession of Faith and Catechisms have done, that our Standards taught the very reverse.—The 8th section of the 8th chapter of our Confession says, “To all those for whom Christ has purchased redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same; making intercession for them; and revealing unto them, in and by the word, the mysteries of salvation; effectually persuading them by his Spirit to believe and obey; and governing their hearts by his word and Spirit; overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation. Suppose that the opposite doctrine to this was taught in our Confession, and that instead of particular redemption being the doctrine of the Scriptures and of our Confession they taught general redemption—a death of Christ for all—and suppose that instead of the doctrine of the assurance of salvation being separable from the assurance of faith, which is the doctrine of Scripture, which exhorts the people to give all diligence to the full assurance of hope to the end, that the Scriptures declared that the assurance of salvation is of the essence of faith,—and suppose that instead of this Confession of ours declaring that these two are quite separable, just suppose that instead of this being the doctrine of our Standards that they taught the very reverse, universal redemption, and that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation; and suppose that Mr. C. had been libelled for, teaching that Christ loved his own, and gave his life for the sheep, that he had other sheep who were not of this fold, that he was obliged to bring in—that Christ purchased the church with his blood, instead of saying that he purchased the world by his blood; and for preaching that assurance is not of the essence of faith,—then had Mr. C. brought forward such a pleading as

he laid before us, and proved that he preached exactly what is contained in this voluminous proof—what is deposed to by every witness for the prosecution or for the defender, (they have deposed that he always taught universal atonement and pardon,—pardon of all sins, past, present and future—every one of his own witnesses swears, “I having heard Mr. C. teach on these subjects, and instead of teaching particular redemption, and forgiveness of sins on the faith and repentance of the sinner, I have heard him preach that Christ bought every human soul by his blood, and that every sin of every human creature was completely and fully forgiven, and that a man who is a believer cannot be without the assurance of God’s love to himself.”)

“If, in the circumstances I have been supposing, you had found that defence proven by such a cloud of honest witnesses, could you have convicted him? You could not. But the Bible and our Standards hold particular redemption. They hold, that we are to examine ourselves, prove ourselves, and to make our own calling and election sure; to give all diligence to the full assurance of hope to the end; and that we have a necessity for going on in making perpetual progress to confirm our confidence that we are believers in Christ. The Apostle John writes his first epistle, on this principle, to believers;—and I maintain that the body of proof against Mr. C. brings home the charges to him—that the case is clearly made out. The Reverend Doctor then proceeded to remark upon the evidence, as applying to the different counts in the libel, agreeing entirely with the views of it taken by Dr. Graham. In speaking of the third and fifth counts, he remarked, It is said, then, that Dr. Burns misapprehended the meaning of the sermon he heard; but when people deviate from the received doctrines, unless you become a disciple, you never understand them—you are a perfect idiot—you have not the fifth part of an eye; and if you were to put it to any one of the present teachers who are deviating from the truth, you would find that, in all Scotland, excepting in the few individuals that have embraced their errors, there are none that know the smallest particle about it. But it has been attempted to prove, that Dr. Burns did misapprehend him, by bringing other witnesses to swear, that he said very different things at other times. But, if once you part from the anchor, you are sometimes found in the

river, sometimes in the loch ; but never to be found twice in the same place. Mr. C. might state ideas in Dr. Burns' hearing ; but being shaken and driven out of them, the next time he went into the pulpit he renounced them. His system has been always changing. You will find the witnesses deponing sometimes one thing, sometimes another. You hear one witness swearing, that faith is communion with God—the knowledge of a moral truth—the knowledge of that truth that puts you into the image of God—that gives you fellowship and enjoyment with God. And when it was asked Mr. Hawkins, by what power a man believed the Gospel?—he said, no man would believe in Christ but by the power of the Holy Ghost ; but that this is the condemnation of man, since there was no physical impossibility in a man's believing one testimony, who could believe another testimony ; and that believing the testimony of man, he will not believe the testimony of God, which is greater. There is a quantity of evidence all bringing out this, that faith is nothing more than the belief that Christ has forgiven you. Towards the close of the proof it was repeatedly asked, whether is faith the belief of a historical fact, or a moral truth ; and then we get out the distinction, that it had something moral in its nature, and practical in its tendency. There are other things on which I need not dwell. The definition, in one place, of a Christian, is—a man that is rejoicing in God ; the definition, in another place, is that he is a man who believes in the record God has given of his Son. Thus, I am perfectly satisfied of the truth of every statement of Dr. Burns' deposition, and I am under correction, if the deposition of a single witness is not perfectly sufficient to establish a charge—especially if there are a number of charges all bearing upon the same thing.

After some farther observations on the evidence, and also on the printed Notes of Mr. Campbell's Sermons, he concluded thus :—I am sorry to come to this conclusion, for I know that Mr. C. might have been a most useful pastor, and I am sorry that he has thrown away his powers ; and while he thinks that he is in harmony with the Scriptures, he is altogether opposed to them."

Mr. Gregor.

Moderator,—I certainly did intend this morning to say a very few words, and I put down two or three notes for my use,

at the time breakfast was getting ready, but I find I have left them behind me: on this account I shall be less methodical, but probably you may think it no loss that I have left my paper at home. Some may think that, as I did not hear the deposition of all the witnesses—I only heard two of them—some may think that it looks something like presumption in me to pronounce any opinion upon the evidence, as a member of this Court. I once thought so myself, and intended to have been silent; but I saw reason to alter my opinion. Perhaps, at some subsequent period, I might have felt that I had been guilty of a dereliction of duty. My conscience might say, that my motive for declining the discharge of it was of a selfish nature—that it originated in a wish to avoid my share of any ephemeral odium of which we may be the objects. I believe it will only be ephemeral. I wish the public could enter into our private feelings. I never entered upon any one duty with so much reluctance. I have endeavoured to read this proof—I have studied it the best way I could; and have analyzed it, as my reverend fathers, Drs. Hamilton and Graham, appear to have done, and as the learned counsel has done: I marked most minutely and extensively in the pages of the libel, the page and letter of the printed evidence that referred to the charges, both generally and specially. But I do not mean, at present, to give you even a sample of this analysis. I shall confine myself to a few general remarks on the nature of the printed evidence. I do think it is not very valuable. My opinion of the kind of evidence we have received is not improved—not in the least altered since I pronounced it in the hearing of this court—which opinion I now regret that I did not endeavour to have minuted; for I very much doubt that the Supreme Court will find that the Presbytery of Dumbarton have been wasting their time to a great extent. There is not a tythe of what is printed in this paper that is worth the name of evidence: I would have dispensed with the whole of it without feeling the loss. Give me the admission made by the defender, that the pamphlets, entitled *Notes of his Sermon*, are faithful representations of what he teaches; and that, with his own answers, was quite sufficient for me. I do not think, that either the evidence for the prosecution or defence is at all satisfactory—the sworn evidence I mean. I think, however, that the former is superior, in some respects, to

the latter; and I shall just point out to you in what respects I think it superior, simply for the purpose of satisfying you that I know something of the matter. The witnesses for the libellers are particularly specific—they condescend upon dates, and texts, and heads of discourses—nay, in some most important instances, they give you the very words that he used. I find no such minuteness—no such circumstantiality in the exculpatory proof: I find it vague and indefinite. I was never in the custom of disguising my sentiments for fear of offending any man; and I must say, that the depositions of two or three of the witnesses reminded me very much of so many fragments of tent preachings; as if the Presbytery of Dumbarton had been met to hear an account of the witnesses' great extent of information about the Scriptures, and hear them quoted as glibly as any professional man among us all can do; in fact, it struck me as if an attempt was making to convert the members of the court, and not to give them evidence at all. That was my impression, and it is still my impression. There was a great deal too of what struck me at the time as very suspicious evidence. I will endeavour to convey my meaning to the court. One gentleman, of whom, by the way, I have a most respectable opinion,—he seems a very well educated man; and a man under the influence of religious feeling—when certain questions were put to this gentleman he paused for one, two, or three minutes, repeatedly. Now I know something about the constitution and endowments of the human mind, and also about its operations, and how they are carried on. When I speak from memory, I see the answer, with my mind's eye, instantaneously, or I do not see it; but when I speak from reflection, supposition, or invention, I must be very cautious—extremely cautious. I am far from insinuating that the gentleman was conscious that he was not giving the matter from his own personal knowledge; but it was the impression on my mind that he neither wished to offend his own conscience by saying too much, nor yet to leave unsaid any one thing that would help his friend. It is quite impossible for me to separate this man's private opinion from the matter of his evidence; and I doubt not that the same thing occurred in many other instances. There is another thing that occurred to me respecting the evidence—the evidence of the witnesses for the prosecutors seemed as far as I could judge, to have been strictly

impartial—they did not seem to have any leaning either one way or another. I wish I could say the same thing of the witnesses on the other side. It is no matter of calumny that all these gentlemen are my reverend brother's private friends—that they entertain his opinions, and, as far as their influence extends, endeavour to propagate them. I have no doubt they see the difference, in point of efficiency, as their agent, between Mr. C., minister of the parish of Row, and Mr. C., stript of his gown, wandering up and down through the country expounding his principles. We are all, even the most impartial of us, acting every day under the influence of motives of which we are not conscious.

∴ I will not enter more minutely upon the evidence, for reasons that I have already stated. I agree most completely with my reverend fathers, Drs. Grahame and Hamilton. The doctrine of universal atonement and pardon is just as distinctly admitted by Mr. C., at the 15th page of his answers, as it is possible for words to make it; and the other doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation, is evidently written, as with a sunbeam, in almost every page, both of his answers and the depositions.

Mr. Proudfoot expressed his regret that the opinion which he found himself compelled to entertain, regarding this case, was any thing but the opinion he could, from the bottom of his heart have wished to entertain. He said that the evidence appeared to him so full, distinct, and conclusive, that he felt he had only one duty to discharge as a minister of the Church of Scotland, and a believer in the revealed word of God, and that was to declare, after going fully into the libel and the evidence, that the doctrines charged in the libel were fully proven; and that, with regard to the different counts, he need only say, that he fully agreed with the opinions already expressed by his reverend fathers.—He concluded by saying, that while he would willingly turn round and embrace his brother, did he see him what he had hoped to see him,—a labourer in the same vineyard, entertaining the same views, and animated with the same hopes, as himself,—that no tie, however strong, would deter him from declaring fearlessly that the charges, in every iota, were fully and distinctly proven.



### Mr. Story.

It will be in the recollection of my reverend fathers and brethren, that when Mr. C.'s answers were laid upon the table, I then gave it as my opinion that any farther investigation of his peculiar opinions was totally unnecessary. I was, I believe, solitary in my opinion. I was sure, from what I knew of Mr. C.'s opinions, and from what I saw in his answers, that he had given a very open and ingenuous exposition of his theological principles. It was thought, however, necessary to engage in this most laborious investigation of so many days; and the consequence has been the accumulation of an immense mass of evidence; and, after all, it appears that nothing is contained in these statements but what was contained in his answers. At least this is the opinion of my fathers and brethren who have spoken before me. I certainly am sorry to think that it is necessary for me to allude to some observations made by those who have preceded me, before I examine the evidence which bears on the different counts. I attended most carefully from the beginning to the close of every sederunt of this reverend Presbytery; and my conclusion from the evidence was very different from that of the reverend brother who spoke last. I never did see, upon the whole, so many individuals apparently most conscientiously delivering their evidence on a difficult matter. I mean to apply this, generally, to the witnesses for the prosecution and the defence. It has been confessed by Dr. Hamilton that the doctrines were not understood but by the followers of Mr. C., therefore, those individuals who were giving their testimony could not be supposed always, and at once, to understand what was meant by the questions that were put. This may account for the delay of some of the witnesses in giving their answers; while there is nothing that can, in the least, impeach their conscientiousness and veracity. But without making any other observations, in reference to what has passed, I feel that, as a judge in this Court, I cannot but come to a different conclusion from those who have preceded me.

Mr. Story then went over the different counts in the libel, and, at considerable length, examined the evidence adduced in proof of them.

He remarked, with regard to the second and fourth counts,

that he was still of the same opinion that he formerly expressed, viz. that they ought not to have been sent to proof, seeing that they referred to a sermon which the members of Presbytery had themselves heard, so that they could themselves easily ascertain the truth or falsehood of what was charged in them; and that it was a mockery of judicial inquiry to ask at witnesses about what they had heard with their own ears.

He contended that the 4th, 6th, 8th, and 9th counts were not proven, and that while the 1st, 2d, and 10th were proven in words, or in substance, that they did not include the doctrines charged in the major proposition of the libel.

He stated that Mr. C. had, in his answers, explained that what he meant by pardon was access to God—that the death of Christ had removed the barrier which previously existed between God and the sinner. And the whole evidence had proved that this was his meaning, and that he had always explained that this was his meaning. And this could never be supposed to be the doctrine charged in the major proposition of the libel. Mr. Story then observed, “And we find that it does not require learning or intellectual accomplishments, or individuals of cultivated minds, to understand the meaning of Mr. C.’s teaching. You find the most intelligent witnesses even among the lower orders of those whom he has called. I allude to Douglas’s deposition, which gives a very clear and satisfactory explanation of what Mr. C. meant when he used the word pardon; and which could leave no doubt whatever on the minds of his people what he meant when he used the word. You find M’Leod, and also M’Auslen, neither of them men of education, and comparatively in humble situations, but obviously having a clear and precise view of Mr. C.’s teaching; therefore there does not appear to me to be the least foundation for the imputation cast on Mr. C.’s doctrine, that it could not be understood—there does not appear, to my mind, the slightest appearance of misconception as to his terms—they are well defined.”

And, for the reasons he assigned, he declared, he must dissent from the finding proposed by Dr. Graham.

Mr. Jaffray, and Mr. Carr, both stated, that at that late hour they would merely state that, though with great reluctance, they could not hesitate to agree with the finding proposed by Dr. Graham.

Mr. Sym.

I had been better pleased to give a silent vote, were it not that although I agree almost entirely with the finding of Dr. Graham, yet the grounds on which I arrive at this conclusion are, in some respects, different from his. You will remember, Sir, that, in the beginning of our proceedings, an objection was stated as to leading proof on the general statement of the minor proposition. The more I have considered that objection, the more am I satisfied that it is well founded; and I fear that, if any part of your finding is to proceed on proof so led, that your proceedings must be overturned altogether. It were desirable, therefore, that we should avoid, in our finding, taking any notice of any proof except that bearing upon the nine specific charges. Confining myself, then, to the specific charges, I come to the same result as Dr. Graham; though he has admitted some evidence that I conceive is not admissible: I shall not detain you by going over it. Then coming to the third and fifth charges; there is here the objection, in the first place, of the error in date, which I am afraid is a vital objection. There is also the objection arising from the evidence of Dr. Burns not being corroborated by any other evidence. The eighth charge is in the same circumstances. I am disposed, however, to give not a little weight to the argument given by Dr. Hamilton, that, if you have similar testimony relevantly brought as to the other charges, these may go to corroborate this. Upon the whole, I would agree with Dr. Graham in finding the charges proven.

Mr. Lochore.

Moderator,—I cannot conceive a more painfully interesting situation in which ministers can be placed, than when grave and serious charges are submitted to their consideration affecting the doctrine and the character of a brother minister. Such is the situation in which we now stand in reference to Mr. Campbell. Not one of us, I am confident, courted this investigation, but would have been most happy to have prevented it, had that been possible; or to have avoided it had that been advisable: the case, however, having come before us, I am fain to believe, that Mr. C. will admit, that we, as judges, have given to the details of

the evidence a patient hearing, and I trust that human passion and prejudice did not at all warp the mind of any one of us, and that we came to the decision on the merits of this question with unbiassed mind. For myself, I must say, that the opinion I have come to, from reading and comparing the evidence, has not been formed rashly, while I rise up here, in my place, and state, that I consider the libel against Mr. C. proven. The question before us is, not what are Mr. C.'s views regarding the Word of God, as understood by him, but whether these views consist with the Standards of our church. Mr. C. is at liberty to maintain and propagate any opinions, on any subject—this is the age and the land of freedom—but, Mr. C. having connected himself with a society whose opinions are defined and recorded for its regulation, he ought to consider himself as bound to stand by the tenets of that church, or honestly to withdraw from that church, to the doctrines of which he had subscribed; but from some of which, I think, he has departed. I conceive that in Mr. C.'s statements, there is much interesting truth—much that is according to life and godliness; but I do likewise say, Sir, much that is opposed to what I have always considered the truth, and to the Standards of the church to which I belong. I do not mean to enter into details as to the manner in which I have arrived at this finding of mine, as to the proving of the libel; the materials which I had collected for that purpose having been anticipated by those who have preceded me. While I say these things, I do so, I trust, without the least hostile feeling to Mr. C. Not a doubt have I, Sir, of Mr. C.'s sincerity in the adopting, or of his zeal in maintaining, these opinions of his; and not a doubt have I of his great anxiety to be a devoted servant of the Master he is intending to serve; and, as little doubt have I that from this heresy God will cause truth to arise—that the truth will be more inquired after, and pure and undefiled religion will be more appreciated. And cause have we to humble ourselves, and to make it a subject of prayer, that we may not be found in any one thing resisting the will of God, or obstructing the cause of truth—if this counsel be of man it will come to nought—if it be of God we cannot overthrow it, for then shall we be found fighting against God.

Dr. Fleming.

I am exceedingly unwilling, at this late hour, to detain you : still I cannot give a silent vote. In a case, where the character or the office of a minister is at stake—where the peace and edification of a whole parish are concerned—where the religious feelings of a large district are interested, and in which the doctrine and discipline of our national Church are involved, it is surely right for all of us to be cautious in coming to a conclusion, and be ready to give to all who may ask it, a reason for the conclusion we have come to. The proceedings have been of unparalleled length, and I think we may say, that we displayed great patience in conducting the case ; and while there might occasionally be some symptoms of impatience, yet, considering the great length of the proceedings, these symptoms are by no means to be wondered at. And now, I am sure, that all these feelings are over, and that every one of us is ready to do according to truth and justice. For myself, I have not a single wish in the matter, except the wish to give righteous judgment—to award, on the one hand, to the prosecutors such redress as the merits of the case will warrant ; and to the defender, on the other hand, that calm and charitable construction of every thing tending to exculpate, to which he is entitled. Much of what I should have felt inclined to say, has been said already ; but, Sir, I happen to differ, fortunately or unfortunately, in some respects from many of my reverend fathers. Indeed, I am not sure that any one of them agree with me in what I consider a very important point in this case. This libel, after stating, in general terms, that the defender holds and has promulgated certain doctrines. These charges were found, by this Court, to be relevant charges. Now, the time and place are first stated generally, and then the statement of time and place is broken down into ten separate charges ; and, in deliberating on the relevancy of the minor proposition of the libel, the Presbytery gave no deliverance on the relevancy of any thing in the minor of the libel, previous to these ten charges—they passed on to the consideration of the separate charges, and found all of them, with one exception, relevant. Now this fact, of the Presbytery not having found the general statements of the minor relevant, has a very important bearing. You will see, from the printed proof, that the counsel for the defender

objected, that the Presbytery had remitted nothing to proof but such portions of these ten charges as had been found relevant by them; and, therefore, that nothing beyond these limits could properly be investigated or proved. On this point I gave the best judgment I could, on the spur of the moment—that the libellers were entitled to lead proof on the general statement; but I added, unless there was some technical objection. Now, I am still of opinion, that if we had found these general statements relevant, we might have admitted them to proof; but not having found them relevant, I am afraid we are precluded from admitting any proof of them. I am, therefore, for giving the defender the full benefit of that objection; and, in making up my mind, I excluded entirely from my view any thing that was said under that head of the proof. It is scarcely necessary for me to go over the separate charges, because my opinion still coincides very much with that expressed by almost all the members of the Court.

Dr. Fleming then went over the various counts, and the evidence relative to them, dwelling at considerable length upon that referring to the sixth charge. He then proceeded:—

“Now, Sir,” Mr. Story says, after having gone over all these charges, “let Mr. C. explain his own words.” Most assuredly.—What have the court been doing, while hearing Mr. C.’s witnesses in exculpation, but hearing his own explanations. If the examination was intended to take the edge off the accusation against Mr. C., it has completely failed. So far as I could understand the drift of the defence, it was that what Mr. Campbell meant, when he said that all were pardoned, was, that by the death of Christ the barrier, that existed between God and sinners, was broken down, and they had now free access to him: and, certainly, if it could have been made out, that he had taught that all men are put merely into a *pardonable* state, a very important point would have been gained in behalf of Mr. C. It would have been happy for him, and for the parish of Row. But what is the effect of this exculpatory proof? The amount of it, to my mind, is, that the witnesses understood him to state, that, by the death of Christ, the sins of all men are actually forgiven—forgiven, whether they believe or not—and that they who are at last condemned, are condemned for disbelieving the fact of

their having been so pardoned, and so being found in their unrighteous state.

“ If the evidence we have heard does not prove that Mr. C. has been using the language that was condemned by the Act of Assembly, I do not see how it can be proved at all. Then in regard to assurance, I could not see any attempt that was successful to take the edge off this charge. I think that neither the Scriptures nor the Standards maintain that assurance is essential to true faith—and it is denied by the Act of 1772, that assurance is of the essence of faith. Dr. Fleming, after a few more remarks, concluded by proposing the judgment of the Presbytery which was ultimately adopted.”

Mr. Dunlop.

I will not take up much of the time of the Presbytery with the few observations I have to make. I must first express my surprise that the Court should be led by three Rev. Drs. into the supposition that Mr. C. debarred certain people from coming to the Lord's table. I have read the evidence with a good deal of attention, and I do not find that any one witness swore that he debarred any person from coming to the Lord's table. He may have warned certain descriptions of people, and I always heard clergymen so warn them, and tell that under such and such circumstances, they would be unwelcome guests at the Lord's table.

There seems to be a very general opinion in the Presbytery, that Mr. C.'s admissions, in his answers, were a sufficient proof of the libel. This was the opinion of the majority of the members in September, when the answers were given in ; but, in December, these members seemed to have taken a new view of it, and did not then consider that the answers of Mr. C. were sufficient to prove the libel. This was my opinion from the beginning. But the question I now ask is, if, by the admissions of Mr. C., in his answers, the libel was not proven, is it proven now by the examinations which have been gone into, while it has not been asserted that this evidence proves any thing more than what Mr. C. has himself admitted ?

A good deal of weight has been given by some of the members to Dr. Burns' evidence. I am disposed to pay no attention to

his evidence. There are circumstances, in regard to Dr. B. which appear to me to make him rather an improper evidence. He had written a pamphlet against Mr. C.—perhaps made money by it—he was a party man—it was *Burns versus Campbell*. I might make some observations on the evidence of another Reverend gentleman, who, I think, had most improperly prejudged the question. I have learned that he, and some other clergymen, made an attempt to debar Mr. C. from preaching in the Floating Chapel, at Greenock; and, I consider this a highly improper interference, while Mr. C. was on his trial before this Court. It does not appear to me that the case has been made one bit better for the prosecution in consequence of the evidence that has been led: and when I take into consideration the highly respectable body of evidence for the defence—when I find from it what he really preached—I am perfectly satisfied that there is no proof of heresy; and I can lay my hand upon my heart and declare, as I shall answer in the day of judgment, that I consider the libel not proven.

After some conversation among the members, Dr. Graham expressed his willingness to alter the finding he had proposed, to meet the views of Mr. Sym and Dr. Fleming, and it was accordingly altered to the form in which it appears in the extract from the Presbytery record, given at page 165.

FINIS.









